

Paper no. 27

Minutes
of the
Working
Committee
1959
Spittal
Austria

COMMISSION ON FAITH AND ORDER

World
Council
of
Churches

28.0.23
C 7370
2nd ser
27-36

COMMISSION ON FAITH AND ORDER

MEETING OF THE WORKING AND FUTURE COMMITTEES

August 3-8, 13, 1959

Spittal, Austria

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

17 Route de Malagnou, Geneva

LIBRARY

World Council of Churches
17, route de Malagnou, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page
MEETING OF THE WORKING AND FUTURE COMMITTEES	1
ATTENDANCE	1
PROCEEDINGS	2
1. Future of Faith and Order	2
2. Reports from Theological Commissions	
(a) Theological Commission on Christ and the Church	7
(b) Theological Commission on Worship	
(i) East Asia	9
(ii) North America	9
(iii) Europe	9
(c) Theological Commission on Tradition and Traditions	
(i) America	10
(ii) Europe	10
(d) Study Commission on Institutionalism	10
3. Inter-Confessional Consultations	
(a) Lutheran-Reformed Consultation	11
(b) Orthodox Consultation	11
4. Publications	12
5. Discussion on Baptism	12
6. Reports of New Developments	
(a) Lambeth Conference on Intercommunion Terminology	17
(b) Lutheran-C.S.I. Agreed Statement on the Ministry	17
(c) New Ecumenical Agencies and Inter-Church Relations	17
7. Regional Extension	
(a) East Asia Christian Conference	18
(b) Faith and Order Office in the U.S.A.	18
8. Roman Catholic Relations	18
9. Week of Prayer	19
10. Faith and Order Research	20
11. Madagascar Invitation	20
12. Presentation of Faith and Order at WCC Third Assembly	21
13. Faith and Order Concerns of the Youth Department	21
14. Plans for 1960 Faith and Order Commission Meeting	22
15. Revision of the WCC Basis	22
16. Elections	22
APPENDIX I	23
APPENDIX II (1-5)	30
APPENDIX III	42
APPENDIX IV	44
MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION	46
MEMBERSHIP OF THE THEOLOGICAL COMMISSIONS	51
CONSTITUTION OF THE FAITH AND ORDER COMMISSION	56

ATTENDANCE

Officers

*The Bishop of Bristol (Rt. Rev. O. S. TOMKINS), *Chairman*
Dean DOUGLAS HORTON, *Chairman of the Commission*
*Rt. Rev. J. E. L. NEWBIGIN, *Vice-Chairman of the Commission*
Dr. KEITH R. BRIDSTON, *Secretary*

Members of the Working Committee

* Principal J. J. CHANDRAN, * Professor H. D'ESPINE, * Professor G. FLO-
ROVSKY, * Professor R. R. HARTFORD, Professor T. A. KANTONEN, Professor
CH. KONSTANTINIDIS, Professor A. C. OUTLER, Dr. E. A. PAYNE, * Professor
E. SCHLINK, Professor J. E. SKOGLUND

Member of the Future Committee

Dean J. R. NELSON (plus those marked *)

Substitutes

Dr. M. A. CREASEY (for Percy Bartlett), Professor E. R. HARDY (for Bishop
Angus Dun), Dr. P. E. PERSSON (for * Professor Wingren), Dr. R. TOBIAS
(for President Gresham), Dr. J. W. WINTERHAGER (for Dr. Jacob)

Visitors

included: Professor T. ARIGA (Japan), Professor W. FREYTAG (Germany),
Dr. E. H. LONG (Canada), Dean WALTER MUELDER (U.S.A.), the Rev.
W. A. NORGREN (U.S.A.), the Rev. T. N. D. C. SALMON (Ireland) and
Dr. FLOYD TOMKINS (U.S.A.)

Staff

Dr. W. A. VISSER 'T HOOFT, Dr. ROSWELL BARNES, Dr. R. S. BILHEIMER,
Dr. NORMAN GOODALL, Dr. H. H. HARMS and the Rev. PHILIP POTTER

Apologies

were received from: Metropolitan JUHANON MAR THOMA, Principal JOHN MARSH,
Principal HAROLD ROBERTS, Professor K. E. SKYDSGAARD, Professor T. M.
TAYLOR and Professor T. F. TORRANCE

PROCEEDINGS

The CHAIRMAN opened the meeting with prayer.

The minutes of the meeting of 15-20 July 1958 (FOC Paper No. 26) were approved.

1. FUTURE OF FAITH AND ORDER

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it had been agreed that the Working Committee and the Future Committee should meet together this year and he welcomed the members of the latter to the meeting. The Interim Report of the Working Committee to the Central Committee on the Future of Faith and Order had been presented to the Central Committee at Nyborg Strand, Denmark, in 1958. It had aroused considerable discussion at that time, as recorded in the Central Committee minutes. Distributed widely since then, the Interim Report had been commented on by a number of individuals and groups, and copies of those comments were in the hands of the Secretary. On the whole they were largely favourable to the proposals made.

One of the points of special interest, as it had been at the meeting of the Working Committee in Geneva in 1958, was the term "churchly unity" used in the Interim Report. Bishop Newbiggin had been asked to elaborate on its meaning and the Committee had before it a paper from him, on which it was proposed that the present discussion should begin. The Chairman suggested that the Committee had a two-fold task before it: (a) clarifying what was meant by the term "churchly unity" as Faith and Order understood it; (b) indicating the organizational consequences following from this view.

Professor OUTLER wished to have something said about the importance of varieties in worship, polity and other matters in a united church, because many people were still unconvinced that churchly unity would not involve monolithic structures. Bishop NEWBIGGIN felt that many of the denominational structures were more rigid than those seen in the New Testament; fully accepting one another in churchly unity does not mean a form of rigidity like those we now see. He found it difficult to answer in a definite way what Faith and Order should do about this, but wondered if it would not be a step forward to say that this was what we believed to be the goal, even though we might not be agreed ourselves about the precise form of it. This would go further than the Toronto Statement. The CHAIRMAN believed that the view of churchly unity found in the Future Report could be paralleled with many statements from Lausanne and Edinburgh, though these had not as yet been re-affirmed by the WCC as such.

Dr. WINTERHAGER was afraid of giving the impression that Faith and Order was in favour of fabricating unity programmatically, of making unity rather than finding it. Professor KANTONEN wished to be more specific in defining churchly unity, though he recognized that this might raise questions about the

“super-church”. The CHAIRMAN doubted that the term “super-church” had any meaning; he could see nothing in the New Testament which was at all suggestive of it, whereas churchly unity was a biblical concept. Professor HARDY said it should be recognized that there were those who regarded the idea of one single church in each country as objectionable; whatever might be meant by these terms there were fears of the WCC getting into a position above the churches and therefore dominating them simply through its unique world-wide status which no individual church had.

The CHAIRMAN felt that much depended upon what was meant by “church” in this context, and particularly what was meant by “local” in Bishop Newbigin’s paper. Professor FLOROVSKY said that he could understand the meaning of unity in these terms at the genuinely local level, but he was not sure what it meant at the diocesan or national level; perhaps he would be regarded as extremely congregational because of this. Bishop NEWBIGIN felt that there were two points of confusion: (a) unity and authority were not the same thing, and what people were afraid of was not the unity of the Church but certain forms of authority over the Church; he did not believe that the Church should be a body organized from one centre administratively: (b) modern developments were making former meanings of the word “local” out of date; in India, for example, it still had its geographical connotations and meant quite clearly a village, but in a modern suburb this was no longer necessarily true — it was possible there to live one’s life only among those whom one had chosen as associates and the geographical area had little meaning as such. By “local” was meant the place or situation where people meet one another and could be responsible for one another.

Professor OUTLER thought that whatever the new meaning of locality, it still had to do with a place, and the problem was that in some churches he was welcome but not in others. The CHAIRMAN agreed that it was not difficult to recognize the locus of Christian disunity whenever it was met and many Christians felt thwarted by the disunity they found in their local neighbourhood, in their factory, or in their university. But would this concern be something to which the WCC could not subscribe? Professor HARDY wondered if this objective of unity should necessarily be that both of the WCC and Faith and Order; what was being said was that real unity was wanted in the deepest things and in this sense this statement and the Toronto Statement go together and complement one another.

Professor HARTFORD said that there was no doubt that the Faith and Order Movement had always been concerned with the kind of churchly unity about which Bishop Newbigin had written. What was now being asked was: should this not also be the goal of the WCC, and, if not, has Faith and Order ever really been properly brought into the WCC? Prof. TOBIAS wondered if there existed a kind of hiatus between Faith and Order’s view of the WCC and that of the Central Committee. The Toronto Statement was made in part to allay fears, but this may have been done so effectively that many of the leaders of the churches have lost interest in the problem of church unity. Should this new statement not be considered in part a statement of confession and penitence for what we have done to ourselves? The CHAIRMAN believed that something should be said in the final document about their conviction that it was the obligation of Faith and Order to call all churches and the WCC itself to consider what this conception of churchly unity involves, and the WCC must be committed to holding before the churches the demand of God that we accept from Him

the gift of unity, which brings all in each area of human living to confess Him as Lord.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that attention should be given to the place of Faith and Order within the WCC and how to assure that the concern for the unity of the Church should make itself felt in the whole life and program of the WCC, especially through the Assemblies and Central Committees. This was related to the question of making Faith and Order into a division rather than a department as at present. The General Secretary had pointed out last year that these categories are misleading and do not carry with them any particular status. At the same time, the mechanism of an organization does imply a value judgment. The concern of Faith and Order is to secure a mechanism which brings the concern for unity at the centre of every meeting of the WCC. The General Secretary had said that the whole divisional/departmental arrangement is under a question mark and must be reconsidered between this Assembly and the next. But the work of Faith and Order is being frustrated by the present structure, and to postpone the change until the Fourth Assembly is so far in the future that the question must be asked now as to how far the existing machinery is one which really allows the concern of Faith and Order for unity to be felt at the very heart of the WCC's life and at all its meetings.

Prof. TOBIAS said that these proposals came not out of a concern for Faith and Order itself but for the life of the Church as a whole and the cause of unity within it. Prof. HARDY felt that the general division of the Assembly preparations into sections on unity, witness and service indicated something about the view of the churches of the most important elements in the ecumenical movement and also something of the way in which these concerns work together in the life of the churches in their own work.

Prof. SCHLINK recognized that it was necessary to deal with the structural problem at the next Assembly but there was the urgent question of strengthening the present secretariat now with additional senior staff. It was simply not possible for one person to carry the present load of work, much less the new areas of work which the Future Report proposed. As to the structural question, he doubted that two new tasks could be undertaken until there was an improvement in the position of Faith and Order ; these were (a) cooperation with the Orthodox churches ; (b) relations with the Church of Rome. Faith and Order work was in danger of being looked upon as purely a pan-Protestant movement and one found in many quarters, including in Russia when he had visited the Moscow patriarchate, the impression that Faith and Order had ceased to exist since the Evanston Assembly. If increased theological contacts were possible with Rome as a result of the preparations for the proposed Ecumenical Council, this also placed an additional urgent obligation upon Faith and Order to take advantage of these new opportunities.

Prof. SKOGLUND commented that Dr. Harms in his contacts with the Roman Catholics on behalf of the WCC works very closely with the General Secretariat and it was important that his work should continue. Prof. SCHLINK asserted that he did not wish in any way to reduce the prerogatives of the General Secretary in regard to general policy towards the Roman Church. This requires much diplomatic skill and is quite different from the work envisaged by Faith and Order, and he felt that a proper distribution of responsibility between the work of the General Secretary on one side and the kind of theological contacts which Faith and Order had in mind could easily be made.

Bishop NEWBIGIN believed that the very nature of Faith and Order itself forced them to go beyond academic debate to the point where the question was raised as to whether God was asking us to do something about the deeper understanding of churchly unity which study and discussion had brought. Furthermore, the position of Faith and Order is different today because the increasingly ecumenical activity of the churches, whether through the WCC or local councils of churches, while drawing them closer together in cooperative activities has the tendency to push the concern for churchly unity into a peripheral position. Finally, the staff and structural problems of Faith and Order cannot be dissociated; the ability to recruit highly qualified staff may be related to the status of Faith and Order in the organizational structure of the WCC.

Dr. VISSER 'T HOOFT, who joined the Committee for this discussion, said he wished to make his comments in a larger framework. There is a danger that the whole ecumenical movement should become accepted in the minds of the large majority of churchmen as merely an existing movement of cooperation — a useful piece of ecclesiastical machinery. Furthermore, we have largely failed in communicating to our member churches an awareness of the seriousness of our divisions, which has been so central in the thinking of Faith and Order. The Commission should sometimes discuss the reasons for this. Another question to be considered is whether or not there should be a particular department for theology in the WCC. In regard to Roman Catholic relations, these should be fostered by all the means we have available; it should be recognized, however, that there are more Roman Catholics devoting their full-time to ecumenical study than in the Protestant churches and consideration should be given to the implications of this interesting situation. On the point of increasing the staff of Faith and Order it should be understood that those who are theologically qualified for this work, especially those in academic positions, have to make a real sacrifice both financially and at the point of security. Regarding position in the WCC hierarchy, this would not be a great problem; without being an Associate General Secretary, which mainly involves administration, the senior secretary of Faith and Order should have a close relationship with the staff executive group and in general should always be in consultations about policy at the level where policy is made. Dr. Visser 't Hooft went on to say that he did not see any advantage in having Faith and Order made into a division; it would only succeed in isolating it even further from the rest of the WCC. He hoped that the Committee would place their Report in the context of the total life of the Ecumenical Movement.

In response, the CHAIRMAN said that the position of Faith and Order as a department seemed to infer that it is given the same status in the eyes of the WCC as all other departments; one looking at the present organization from the outside could not help but get that impression. It was the Committee's conviction that churchly unity is so fundamental a concern for the whole Ecumenical Movement it would be unfortunate if the present structure were an accurate indication of the attitude of the WCC in regard to this matter. If the divisional/departmental nomenclature is not sacrosanct it perhaps might be altered to make it less misleading. Whatever method of organization is used, there are certain things which the Committee feels must be secured: (a) the centrality of the concern for unity should be made manifest throughout the whole of the WCC: this must be made quite clear, unequivocal, and given priority; (b) on the staffing situation it is urgent that the Faith and Order staff be increased and that it should

be represented in the policy-making of the WCC at the highest level ; this cannot but raise again the structural problem of Faith and Order's organizational status ; (c) making provision for place in WCC meetings of those leaders of the churches who are particularly concerned for church unity ; this involved looking at the adequacy of the overlap between the memberships of the Commission on Faith and Order and the Central Committee.

Prof. OUTLER said that this was not just a question of overlapping memberships in the Commission and Central Committee, but having those on the Central Committee who had previous experience in Faith and Order so that the policy-makers were well-informed before they were called upon to make policy. This, of course, was not primarily a Geneva problem but one of the executive councils of the member churches.

After further discussion it was decided to write a new introduction and rewrite the final section on "Consequences for Organization" in the light of the various points made. When the discussion was resumed later in the Committee these new drafts were commented on and suggestions made for rewording. Prof. D'ESPINE pointed out that the general range of work outlined was not exclusively study but also had to do with action. The advantage of giving Faith and Order divisional status was that it would provide the manoeuvring space, which the Chairman had said was needed, in order to take care of this wide spectrum of work. Dr. VISSER 'T HOOFT believed that to make Faith and Order a division would disrupt the whole present WCC structure. A similar case might be made out for other units and this would only make Faith and Order one among 12 or 15 divisions, which would hardly better the present set-up. He wished the Committee to know that asking for divisional status had far-reaching consequences. Dr. PAYNE reminded the Committee that at the Central Committee meeting at Nyborg both Bishop Newbigin and Prof. Skydsgaard said that the Future Report would have to be considered very carefully by the Commission on Faith and Order. Since it did not meet until the summer of 1960 consideration should be given to what final decisions could be made before then. He thought it possible, however, to get an initial reaction to the revised Report from the Central Committee at Rhodes and also from the Programme and Finance Committee meeting in February. This would all be helpful to the Commission when it considered the question in 1960.

Professor D'ESPINE wondered if it were wise to define the functions of the proposed staff members too closely ; this would depend partly on the persons available and other indeterminate factors. The SECRETARY said that the outline was primarily an indication of the general areas of work which needed to be covered rather than precise job descriptions and there could be a good deal of flexibility in this. Dr. WINTERHAGER seconded by Professor OUTLER, asked that if as many as three or four members of staff were envisaged consideration should be given to the balance of representation of the various confessional and national traditions. The CHAIRMAN said that he felt the question of an Associate General Secretary did not necessarily have to be linked with the question of divisional status, though this had been true in the past. Professor FLOROVSKY thought that there might be some analogy to the position of CCIA in what they were asking for Faith and Order.

Reference was made to the Report of the Programme and Finance Committee, which was in the hands of the members of the Committee. Dr. VISSER 'T HOOFT commented on the complexity of the total organization of the WCC and said

that functional, structural and programmatic factors all had to be considered and balanced with one another. The proposed integration of the IMC and WCC posed additional difficulties. The members of the Committee expressed some concern that decisions reached by the Programme and Finance Committee might limit the possibilities of the Faith and Order Future Committee to propose changes, particularly structural ones, and the Programme and Finance Interim Report appeared at certain points to prejudge issues now under discussion within Faith and Order.

Professor FLOROVSKY did not approve of the apparent insignificant place given to Faith and Order in the present WCC organizational structure. He felt the combination of departments in the Division of Studies was artificial and not necessarily related to one another, and the Division as such did not function as an integrating body because it had no more than a periodical existence. Furthermore he believed that Faith and Order was not just a study body but had an intrinsic relation to the whole area of ecumenical education which, theoretically, was the concern of another Division. It was also his opinion that because it was concerned in a very complicated organizational pattern, both Faith and Order's ability to function as a unit was limited, and also the way from the Theological Commissions to the main platform of the WCC was too long and complicated for them to bring the fruits of their work in effectively.

At the final session on Thursday morning, August 13, the revised draft, including written amendments, was approved. Professor d'Espine was asked to present the Report to the Central Committee, to be seconded by Dean Horton, and this was agreed.

2. REPORTS FROM THEOLOGICAL COMMISSIONS

(a) Theological Commission on Christ and the Church

A written report of the work of the European Section was before the Committee, and Professor HARDY reported on the joint meeting of the American and European Sections which had just been held at Tutzing: he observed that although the meeting was held in Europe the American members present had outnumbered the Europeans. The meeting had proved very profitable, the long session of twelve days resulting in two substantial documents being written. The first (which had already been distributed to the Working Committee) concerned "The Meaning of Baptism". Initially intended as a reply to the questions raised in "A Memorandum on Baptism" by the sub-committee of the full Faith and Order Commission at its meeting at New Haven in 1957, the present document had taken the form of a biblical exposition illustrating the fundamental approach of the Christ and the Church Commission to their work — i.e. to start from the centre rather than from the periphery. In this case the start was from the baptism of Christ in Jordan, which corporately includes the whole Church; and it is from this point of view that all our rites should be seen.

The second product of the meeting was the Theological Commission's Interim Report on its work so far, which was to be presented to the Faith and Order Commission at its forthcoming meeting in 1960. This document chiefly gave something of the theological background for the method the Commission was using, and reported on the stage which had been reached, as well as indicating

the way in which the members' thoughts were moving. Professor Hardy reported that at the meeting the members had expressed a hope that the Working Committee would give permission for the Interim Report to be printed and widely circulated during the coming year, and on behalf of the Commission he submitted a formal recommendation to that effect :

“Be it recommended to the Working Committee of the Faith and Order Commission that authorization be given for the printing and distributing of the Interim Report of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church to a wide circle of readers by June 1960, and that it be presented formally to the meeting of the Faith and Order Commission in August 1960, and that it become a part of the documentation for the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches.”

In 1960 the American Section was proposing to hold a meeting in June, while the European Section would be meeting at the end of July. In both Sections the discussion was planned to centre on “The Work of the Holy Spirit”, for the joint meeting had proved so valuable in bringing together the insights of the two groups that it was now thought possible to continue their work on similar lines for the rest of the period.

With regard to membership of the Commission, Professor Hardy reported that the American Section was at full strength, but that there were now vacancies in the European Section, and enquiries were beginning with a view to filling these. The Commission submitted a recommendation to the Working Committee that Professor G. W. H. Lampe be appointed as Vice-Chairman of the European Section, to succeed Dr. P. S. Watson, who was taking up a post in the U.S.A. This recommendation was accepted unanimously, and Professor Lampe was duly appointed.

In the discussion which followed, much interest was expressed in the Theological Commission's Interim Report. Dean NELSON explained that the final draft was still in process of revision, but gave a brief outline of the contents of the Report. The question of how this material was to be dealt with led to a discussion of the general problem of communicating the results of the Theological Commissions' work in an acceptable way to the churches at large. The SECRETARY explained that it was hoped that the reports of all the Theological Commissions would be available by the end of 1961 as a preparatory document for the Assembly, and he suggested that it would be valuable to have questions appended so that the documents could be put forward for study among groups in the churches or in local councils.

Prof. OUTLER felt that the TCCC Interim Report would be of great value in the theological world, but how to bring it down into the life of the churches ? One of the great frustrations in ecumenical work was to interpret the points of consensus reached by a group working together over a period of time to those who had not been through this process. Bishop Newbiggin wished that such fruits of Faith and Order's Theological Commissions could be translated into simpler materials of a bible-study type for use in local councils of churches and in congregations. Should not Faith and Order become more paedagogical at this point ? There was general agreement with the view of the Chairman that the task of translating material of this sort and rewriting it in terms of the situation in particular countries demanded special gifts and was an extremely arduous task ; it was a perennial problem which faced Faith and Order. Popularization

on an international basis seemed out of question. The SECRETARY, from his experience with theological students in Indonesia, felt that there was interest in the original text of ecumenical documents, but that this needed to be supplemented with explanatory notes and questions adapting it for local use. Several suggestions were made of agencies in various countries which might be approached for this task, and it was also suggested that the Interim Report should be sent to national councils of churches to be translated and distributed by them.

(b) Theological Commission on Worship

(i) East Asia

Principal CHANDRAN, Chairman, reported that owing to travel and financial difficulties it had not been possible for the East Asia Commission to meet as a group; the work had been carried on by national groups in the different areas. The principle subject under consideration had been that of indigenization of worship, including the revisions of the church calendar. He also reported on the formation by the East Asia Christian Conference Assembly of a Committee on the Life, Message, and Unity of the Church which was particularly responsible for promoting Faith and Order concerns. Principal Chandran was Chairman of the Committee and the Rev. J. R. Fleming of Singapore the Secretary. This was an important step forward and meant that the EACC had definitely taken up the work of Faith and Order, especially the Theological Commission on Worship, and regarded this as one of its chief responsibilities.

This information was warmly welcomed by the Committee. In the brief discussion following, the Chairman and Prof. Skoglund asked for additional information on the indigenization studies and Principal Chandran and Bishop Newbigin gave further details on these.

(ii) North America

The SECRETARY reported on his consultation with Prof. Sittler, the Chairman of the North American section, in Chicago in June. The meeting of the Commission which he was to have attended during his American visit during the spring was postponed until September. This group was one of the last to be activated and had been slow in getting underway. According to Prof. Sittler they had spent most of their time discovering what were the false leads in their subject. However, the discussions had been lively and stimulating and there was hope that they would soon be moving into a more constructive period in their work together. There was a general feeling, according to the Secretary, which was shared with the other sections, that the time was not yet ripe for a joint meeting of the whole Commission, but it had been suggested that this might take place sometime during the time of the Third Assembly of the WCC in India. This would require considerable financial resources and this question was now under investigation.

(iii) Europe

A written report from the officers of the Commission was present (Appendix II.3) and the SECRETARY commented on various points in response to questions from the Committee, and expressed appreciation for the excellent progress made by this group despite a late start. It was reported that Professor Boris Bobrinsky and Professor Claus Westermann had been invited to become members of this Commission.

(c) Theological Commission on Tradition and Traditions

(i) *America*

A summary progress report of the American Section of the Commission was before the members of the Committee (Appendix II.4). Prof. OUTLER, the Chairman, in commenting on it pointed out that the American and European sections had diverged in their approach to the problem — the American group taking a more historical line, analyzing how concrete examples of change affects the way in which the faith is received and transmitted, whereas the European section had followed the exegetical line, seeking to define the problem in terms of the New Testament. They would try to sum up some of the historiographical and theological implications of their work by 1960 and he hoped that some Interim Report would be then forthcoming.

Prof. FLOROVSKY, Vice-Chairman of the Commission, spoke of the great relevance of this topic for the Orthodox Church and also mentioned some of the important new writing being undertaken in this field by Roman Catholic scholars. Changes in the Commission's membership were reported.

(ii) *Europe*

The SECRETARY reported on the work of the European Section on the basis of a letter from the Chairman, Prof. Skydsgaard. He mentioned the difficulty in beginning their work and outlined the present plan to have one member of the Commission, a systematician, prepare a basic paper, on which other members would write extended comments. At the meeting of the Commission to be held in Holland in August a Roman Catholic scholar would be present at some of the sessions and would read a paper. Prof. OUTLER reported that he would be present at this meeting and he and Prof. Skydsgaard were planning to discuss the coordination of the work of the two Sections.

It was suggested that the European Section might wish to add Prof. Caird to its membership, in view of the fact that he was leaving North America to take up a new appointment in England.

(d) Study Commission on Institutionalism

Dean MUELDER, the Chairman, gave a comprehensive review of the work of the Commission up to date, including its recent meeting at Tutzing. He also commented on the Summary Report prepared by Prof. Nils Ehrenström, Secretary of the Commission, which was distributed to the members of the Committee. (Appendix II.5). He noted that Tutzing had been the first occasion on which a representative number of European theologians could be present for a Commission meeting. Referring to the need to focus the study on the problem of unity, he pointed out an emergent problem which had been exposed during their explorations — that of ecumenical institutionalization as well as the increasingly apparent obsolescence of pre-ecumenical institutional arrangements of all the churches. The Tutzing meeting had also raised once again the question of the relation between the theological and sociological approach to institutionalism. After a long and difficult, but nevertheless illuminating discussion, the Commission had come to a generally accepted viewpoint on the interwoven and complementary nature of the two approaches; most clearly agreed was that the study ought to help the churches to see their own structures sociologically as well as theologically and to provide them with the means for self-criticism to "unmask" and overcome some of the barriers to Christian unity. A written report of the Tutzing meeting

of the Commission was also distributed to the Committee, including an outline for a projected symposium volume. Dr. H.-H. Schrey had been invited to become a member of the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Dean Muelder for the report and said that it was exciting to see things, not usually thought to be related, so closely together in this project. In answer to a question from the Chairman, Dean Muelder explained the process whereby they sought to make sociological critiques of the theological structures and theological critiques of the sociological structures. Prof. SCHLINK suggested that attention be given to the question of worship as an institutionalizing factor in the early church. Other members of the Committee made suggestions for future case studies. Prof. FLOROVSKY thought that a study of nationalism should be made, especially in relation to the Orthodox churches, and Prof. KANTONEN believed that a sociological study of the Reformation would be valuable.

3. INTER-CONFESSIONAL CONSULTATIONS

(a) Lutheran-Reformed Consultation

Dr. HARMS reported that the Consultation had been held at Arnoldshain in April, the subject for discussion being Baptism. At this meeting the discussions had been somewhat handicapped by the small number of Lutherans in attendance and Dr. Harms had been asked to take steps to ensure a more evenly-balanced group in the future. Letters were being written to those who had not attended recently, and arrangements were being made for replacements and new members. Next year it was planned to discuss the Lord's Supper, basing this on the theses produced last year by the EKID, in the wider perspective of the talks which had been going on in France and Holland. The Consultation would be held in Alsace, the first time the meeting had been held in France. An interesting development was that whereas up to now the members had insisted that the results of their work should not be published, this year they had agreed that the Theses on Baptism (Appendix III), drafted at the meeting in April, should be published in the *Ecumenical Review*. The question was now being raised as to whether the churches as such wish to be more closely connected with these discussions than hitherto.

(b) Orthodox Consultation

The SECRETARY reported on the plans for the Faith and Order Consultation between theologians of Orthodox and other churches. It would take place at Kifissia, near Athens, in Greece immediately before the Central Committee meeting. The Consultation was to be small and informal, with approximately twelve Orthodox theologians and twelve from other churches. Considering the importance of this pioneering meeting, a "first" for Faith and Order, it was encouraging that such an outstanding and widely representative group of theologians had accepted invitations to participate. Four papers would be presented and discussed but it was not intended that the meeting itself or the results of the deliberations should be widely publicized. Prof. Ioannidis, a member of the Commission on Faith and Order, was in charge of local arrangements on behalf of the Church of Greece, which was acting as host, and without his energetic efforts the meeting would not be possible. It was particularly fortunate that Dean Horton, Chairman of the Commission, and who would be chairing the Consultation, and Bishop Tomkins, Chairman of the Working Committee, would both be present for this important event.

4. PUBLICATIONS

The CHAIRMAN said there were two main questions facing the Committee in regard to publications: (a) a small volume, or volumes, containing the Interim Reports of the Theological Commissions, possibly for circulation at the Third Assembly in 1961 to give an indication of the work of Faith and Order up to date; (b) larger volumes providing the substance of the material coming out of the Theological Commissions, either in the form of symposia such as for Lund or in other ways.

Prof. TOBIAS believed it would be helpful to have a substantial essay introducing the Interim Reports, perhaps set in the context of "churchly unity" and Bishop Newbigin wondered if this might not be of such a sort that it could be put before the Assembly on its own, indicating the main lines of interest of Faith and Order at this time. Dean NELSON recalled the Faith and Order pamphlet (F. & O. Paper No. 19) published before Evanston and thought something of the sort might be published again, both for Assembly delegates and general circulation.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether there was any possibility that the proposed "Dun's Digest" of agreed statements on Faith and Order questions might be prepared in time to serve as preparatory material for the Assembly. Bishop NEWBIGIN and Prof. OUTLER suggested that the work of research on this might well be done by a seminary or university theological faculty. It was generally agreed that the proposed Digest should be confined to the statements from the three World Conferences on Faith and Order and the two Assemblies of the World Council of Churches, these having some authoritative significance and also preventing the document from becoming too large. The Committee agreed to a suggestion that Dean Nelson, Prof. Tobias and Mr. Norgren be asked to investigate the possibility of having this work done in the United States as a research project in some theological faculty, bearing in mind the thought that this material might be used as Assembly preparatory materials.

The CHAIRMAN noted the financial complications in regard to Faith and Order publications, especially the larger Lund-type volumes, and believed that some kind of subsidy would be required by an eventual publisher. The Committee agreed that if a uniform format were not considered vital, each Theological Commission should be responsible for finding its own publisher. The SECRETARY was asked to pursue these investigations and report to the Working Committee in 1960.

5. DISCUSSION ON BAPTISM

The report "The Meaning of Baptism," prepared by the Joint Meeting of the TCCC at Tutzing, was before the members, and a preparatory paper for the Tutzing meeting prepared by Bishop Anders Nygren had been distributed previously. Dr. Ernest A. PAYNE introduced the discussion with a "Study on the Implications of Baptism for Christian Unity":

It may prove useful as a prelude to our discussion briefly to recall the point we seem to have reached in our consideration of this theme. The Lund Conference in 1952 drew attention to a challenging sentence in one of the preparatory papers written by Professor Torrance. The sentence ran: "To refuse the Eucharist to those baptized into Christ Jesus and incorporated into his resurrection body (i.e. the Church) amounts either to

a denial of the transcendent reality of holy Baptism or to attempted schism within the Body of Christ" (*Intercommunion*, p. 339). The Lund Report, in drawing attention to this passage, said: "We believe that this challenging statement might provide the starting point for further fruitful ecumenical discussion." Two years later the second Assembly of the World Council of Churches carried the matter somewhat further with the declaration: "We must learn afresh the implications of the one Baptism for our sharing in the one Eucharist." These declarations at the ecumenical level coincided with — if they were not directly the product of — a spectacular revival of interest in the rite of Christian initiation. This revived interest has shown itself particularly in churches of the Reformed and Anglican traditions, but has by no means been confined to them. The concern has been directed both to the theology and the practice of baptism.

In view of the context within which the matter was raised at Lund, it was decided to accept the offer of the European Section of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church to prepare a Working Paper for the meeting of the full Faith and Order Commission at New Haven in 1957. This Working Paper, with its challenging opening statement that "Within the disunity of the churches, the unity of baptism has remained," provided a spirited discussion. It would have been very extraordinary had the Working Paper received immediate unanimous acceptance, though those who prepared it seem to have expected a rather more favourable reception than it actually received. After the discussion, Professor Fairweather of Canada, Principal Harold Roberts of England, and Professor Devadutt of India and the U.S.A. prepared a supplementary memorandum, which — basing itself on the judgment that the Working Paper had overestimated the unity implicit in the widespread mutual recognition of the churches of one another's baptisms — urged that there must be further discussion of five inter-related issues.

It is regretted that the Fairweather-Roberts-Devadutt memorandum was not included in full in the Minutes of the New Haven meeting (FOC Paper No. 25). The five points to which the memorandum draws attention cannot all be satisfactorily summarized in as brief a fashion as is attempted in the Minutes (p. 18). Let me remind you of them:

1. The first issue relates to what was spoken of in the Working Paper as "the corporate baptism of the Church which is already cleansed and sanctified through the self-sacrifice of Christ and the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost." What is the relation thereto of water-baptism?

2. The second issue concerns the relations of baptism to faith and raises the historic point of controversy as to who should be baptized. Should it be only those who are thereby making a personal profession of faith, or is it justifiable to baptize infants, and, if so, all infants, or only those of Christian parents?

3. The third issue arises whatever answer is given to these questions. What exactly does baptism effect? This, of course, involves the general question of sacramental efficacy and the means by which the grace of God is mediated.

4. The fourth issue has to do with the place of baptism in the process of Christian initiation as a whole. What is the relation of confirmation and chrismation to baptism on the one hand and to admission to communion on the other? Do the differences of practice in the different traditions point to basic disunities, or are they in fact different ways of expressing certain common principles and convictions?

5. The final issue relates to the actual role played by baptism in our different traditions in the pastoral care of the local congregation. Are there non-theological factors which at this point affect both doctrine and practice?

These are searching questions and the memorandum as a whole provides a most valuable starting point for further study and discussion. We have also certain additional material for our consideration. I leave aside individual contributions such as Markus Barth's *Die Taufe — Ein Sakrament?* and Joachim Jeremias's revision of his earlier monographs *Die Kindertaufe in den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten* (Edinburgh 1958); and mention only materials presented to us with substantial corporate backing or as part of our ecumenical discussion.

(1) The Special Commission of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland on Baptism, which in 1955 issued a report on the biblical teaching regarding baptism, has now prepared a revised and shortened form of the report for use as a study document (The Saint Andrew Press, 1958). The Commission's second interim report, published in 1956, dealt with the history of baptismal belief and practice up to the time of Augustine. The third interim report, which appeared in 1957, dealt with the history during the period of the Middle Ages and the Reformation. The 1958 instalment outlined the teaching of the Scottish Reformers. Still further material is to be expected from the Scottish Commission. Its reports, whether or not all that is in them prove acceptable either within or without the Church of Scotland, are most valuable, thorough and stimulating documents. They start from the viewpoint that "the meaning, efficacy and necessity of Baptism are to be understood only in the light of the salvation events" (Study document, p. 14)—i.e. the Incarnation and Atonement, and this view is presented with learning and cogency.

(2) The North American Conference on Faith and Order which met at Oberlin in the autumn of 1957 had a section on Baptism for which various papers were prepared and which issued a brief statement consisting of "Affirmations and Agreements," a "Statement of Differences" and a number of questions resulting from the fact that, though the significant differences appeared to be rooted in different views of the Church "the question of the Church looks differently to us now that we have become more aware of our deep unity in baptism" (Oberlin Reports, p. 41). The report had to admit, however, "a widespread carelessness or apparent slackness in regard both to the practice of and the teaching concerning Baptism" (p. 39).

(3) The European theologians of the Reformed and Lutheran traditions, who have been meeting together regularly for some years, have given attention to the subject of baptism, and have prepared a series of agreed theses on Who acts in Baptism? What happens to us in Baptism? How does this happen in Baptism? and How do we use Baptism aright? In making available the results of their agreement, the members of the Consultation admit that the problem of infant baptism will need further discussion.

(4) Under the title *Christian Baptism: A fresh attempt to understand the rite in terms of Scripture, History and Theology* (Lutterworth Press, 1959) a group of British Baptists have produced a somewhat substantial volume of essays covering much of the same ground as do the Scottish Reports, though from a rather different standpoint, but adding them to an important essay on "The Theology of Baptism" by the Rev. Neville Clark, whose 1956 monograph on *An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments* (S.C.M.) has already attracted considerable attention. The theology of baptism, it is declared, in words reminiscent of the Scottish report, "must be written round the two poles of the baptism of Jesus at Jordan and its fulfilment in His death, resurrection and ascension" (p. 306).

(5) The Liturgical Commission of the Church of England, in the light of the three reports on Baptism and Confirmation issued by the Joint Committees of the Convocations of Canterbury and York, in 1944, 1949 and 1954 respectively, have now drafted revised services of Baptism, both of infants and of adults. Two sentences from the introduction to the report in which three draft services are contained (SPCK 1959), make the standpoint plain: "In the New Testament Adult Baptism is the norm, and it is only in the light of this fact that the doctrine and practice of Baptism can be understood. The Commission has therefore rearranged the present services of Baptism and Confirmation so as to set forth their theological meaning as well as to make them more flexible in the present pastoral situation" (p. x). This has involved placing first the order for the Baptism of those who are of age to answer for themselves, whereas in the present Book of Common Prayer this is an adaptation of the service for infants.

(6) We have finally the paper prepared by Bishop Nygren for this summer's meeting of the Theological Commission, together with a memorandum drafted by Professor David Cairns of Aberdeen, in 1957, after the New Haven discussion. Bishop Nygren bases his paper on the view that "the discussion in New Haven made it clear that the idea of recognizing the baptisms of other "churches" was not due to any common view of baptism, but was often connected with the fact that so little significance was attached

to baptism that there was no need for it to become a point of controversy between the "churches" (pp. 1-2). The Bishop regards the New Haven discussion as mainly valuable in preventing ecumenical discussion entering a cul-de-sac, through taking baptism as a starting-point for an understanding of the unity of the Church. He regards it, however, as a challenge to a deeper study of the meaning of baptism "in the wide context of the salvation-history which proceeds from Christ and is present and active in his Church" (p. 2), and offers us a study based on Scripture of the baptism of John, the baptism of Jesus by John, and what in the light of Jesus' baptism Christian baptism means for the Church and for the individual.

It will be seen that the most important parts of this new material concentrate attention on the first three of the five questions propounded in the Fairweather-Roberts-Devadutt memorandum, namely (1) the relation of water-baptism to the corporate baptism of the Church, (2) the question of the validity of infant baptism, and (3) the question of what exactly baptism effects. What seem to me the most important contributions — at any rate for our purpose here — and this is without disparagement of the others — are the Scottish reports, the essay by Neville Clark and the paper by Bishop Nygren. These are all of considerable value, particularly as far as the first question is concerned, and they exhibit a considerable agreement both in general standpoint and in detailed exposition. This should, I think, encourage us, for these treatments of the subject come respectively from a Reformed, a Baptist and a Lutheran background. All three are primarily concerned with biblical theology.

On the second question, that of the validity of infant baptism, they seem to me less satisfactory. There is an unfortunate "edginess" — if the term may be allowed — in the references to believers' baptism in the Scottish reports, its contrasts are over-sharpened, its assertions a little too dogmatic. If, as the Scottish Report claims — and this is agreed by the Bishop and would not, I think, be rejected by Neville Clark though he might put the point somewhat differently — if "the norm of all baptism" is the baptism of Jesus in Jordan, we have surely to be careful not to emphasize to the exclusion of all else that "in baptism we are passive," whereas — to quote the Scottish study documents — "in the Lord's Supper, on the other hand, an active participation on our part is required" (p. 54). We may all agree that the initiative in baptism is with God. "It is God who is dealing with man in baptism" says Bishop Nygren (p. 9). "The priority is always with God... and this principle remains regulative for the theology of baptism," says Neville Clark. But he goes on to argue — as I think rightly — that "the inseparability of divine action and human response must never be denied" (pp. 311-312), since it is the whole Christ, truly God but also truly Man, who is our pattern. I appreciate the careful and sympathetic, even if warning, words about believers' baptism, with which Bishop Nygren closes his paper. It no doubt looks to some as if Baptists regard baptism as "a human achievement," or so interpret it. I can only say that I do not think that in practice this is what is emphasized or believed. The dominant note in our services — and in the preparation that precedes them — is identification with Christ, obedience to his command, a following in his footsteps. The three Reformed-Lutheran theses under the heading "What happens to us in Baptism?" would be happily subscribed to by most Baptists, though some would question whether it is wise to say, *simpliciter*, that all that is claimed happens "by baptism."

Here, however, we face the third of the Fairweather-Roberts-Devadutt questions — that regarding sacramental efficacy, and I am not sure that we are yet ready for this discussion, or at any rate whether the assertions in these documents help us very much. Before we can proceed very far in this field we have to define our terms a little more carefully. I can perhaps best illustrate what I mean from Professor Cairns's memorandum. When he urges us to "seek afresh our unity in the teaching of the Scriptures, especially about the baptism of Christ with which by baptism and by faith we are united" (p. 1); when he speaks of "that which was done for us once and for all in history in Christ's own baptism" (p. 2) and of "the baptism of Christ, to which our baptism points" (p. 3) — is he referring to the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan by John or to the *baptisma* to which our Lord referred in Luke 12 : 50 and Mark 10 : 38 and Matt. 20 : 22 ? The two must not be separated, you may reply. But if we say with the Scottish study

document that "baptism is the sign of our sharing in the One Baptism of Christ, which He underwent once for all and one for all on the Cross" (p. 18), do we mean that the sharing is effected by the rite of water-baptism? That it is *something* more than "a symbolical act... merely representing the redemptive action" — to adopt the language repudiated in the Reformed-Lutheran statement — may be true, but how much more? Whoever it may be administered to, water-baptism is obviously by itself proleptic and unfulfilled. Luther gained strength by repeating "Baptizatus sum," but not all Luther's contemporaries did the same; nor do ours. We must surely be very careful not to claim as actuality what is — by the grace of God — possibility.

Finally, I would call attention to the frank admission by Neville Clark that in his view "no immediately obvious or conclusive answer" as to the rightful recipients of baptism is forthcoming if we appeal to the practice of the New Testament age. "The direct evidence from the New Testament seems best characterized," he says, "by the adjective 'flimsy'" (p. 310). The overriding appeal must always be to the New Testament theology (p. 311). But at this seat of judgment none of us can claim to be faultless either in our practice or in our current teaching, none has ground for the unqualified dismissal or condemnation of the other. At the present time no church is particularly easy in conscience, I think, regarding Baptism. All we can do is, in the name of the One True Church, to continue the ecumenical discussion.

Prof. HARDY noted that there seemed to be a converging of lines in all this which was an interesting ecumenical phenomenon. Prof. KANTONEN said that unity was found in a christological approach and in seeing Jesus' Baptism as a part of the total *Heilsgeschichte*. Prof. FLOROVSKY said that the baptismal practice of the ancient church was a living liturgical comment on this. Mr. SALMON felt that the document "The Meaning of Baptism" was somewhat weak on the question of regeneration and also needed further development on the point of one another's baptisms. Prof. KANTONEN pointed out that in Lutheran teaching daily regeneration is bound up with the doctrine of Baptism. Prof. OUTLER believed, however, that a distinction had to be made between Baptism once-for-all and daily renewal, even though closely related.

Dean NELSON reported that the TCCC Joint Meeting at Tutzing which had drafted the present Baptism report had recommended that it be printed and widely distributed. It was hoped that the Working Committee might amplify the sections on the implications of Baptism for pastoral care and for church unity.

In the discussion which followed, special attention was given to the question of the implications of Baptism for Christian unity and comments were directed both to Dr. Payne's paper and to the document prepared by the TCCC at Tutzing. Considerable time was devoted to discussing the relation between unity in Baptism and unity in Holy Communion. Prof. OUTLER said that this was of importance for the practical, everyday life of the churches. Prof. SKOGLUND believed that it was necessary to approach this question through a christological interpretation of the Eucharist. Prof. SCHLINK welcomed the document from Tutzing as a significant step forward. He thought that the consequences for pastoral care and for churchly unity, on which the Working Committee had been especially asked to comment by the TCCC group, were already sufficiently implied in the document and did not need further elaboration. He felt it would be unwise to consider the relation of Baptism and Holy Communion at this stage since this would mean entering into an almost entirely new subject. If the Faith and Order Commission could reach a consensus on Baptism on the basis of the present document, this would be a major accomplishment in itself. Prof. Schlink did not agree with the paper that unity in Baptism was *no* ground on which

ecumenical work can be based ; this was only partially true, for if we have truly been joined in Baptism then Baptism can be a starting point. Prof. HARDY explained on behalf of the drafting group that what the document tried to put forward was that the fact that some recognize other's baptisms is not in itself a basis of unity : rather, the work of Christ in Baptism is the sole ground of unity on which we can work.

Proposals were made for distributing the document to a wider circle. It was suggested that a new introduction be made, using some of the materials included in Dr. Payne's paper, and Prof. HARDY agreed to do this editing. It was agreed that the revised document be sent to a number of ecumenical study groups and theological faculties, inviting comments, and that it should be the basic text for the meeting of the Commission on Faith and Order in 1960 when it discussed the question of Baptism.

6. REPORTS OF NEW DEVELOPMENTS

(a) Lambeth Conference on Intercommunion Terminology

It was reported that a letter had been received from the Archbishop of Canterbury (Appendix IV) informing the Faith and Order Commission of the new definitions of the terms "full communion" and "intercommunion" recommended by the Lambeth Conference in 1958 (*Report*, 1. 34-35 and 2. 23-24). In the discussion reference was made to the attempts at standardizing the terminology for ecumenical usage, especially at the Lund Conference in 1952, and the difficulty in getting agreement on these points. It was agreed that the Archbishop's letter should be printed in the Minutes and called to the attention of the members of the Commission.

(b) Lutheran - CSI Agreed Statement on the Church and the Ministry

Principal CHANDRAN and Bishop NEWBIGIN reported on the theological consensus on the Church and the Ministry which had been reached between the Lutherans and the Church of South India. It was one of five "agreed statements" on doctrinal issues between the two groups and formed the basis for consideration of closer relationships now being negotiated. These documents would be published in one book shortly and it was hoped that it might be made known in Faith and Order circles. In response to questions, Bishop NEWBIGIN said that this agreed statement should not be read in isolation from other statements of the CSI on the ministry. It was drawn up in terms of a particular conversation between the Lutherans and the CSI and was not to be considered a departure from the original position of the CSI on the historic episcopate. Copies of the agreed statement were distributed to members of the Committee.

(c) New Ecumenical Agencies and Inter-Church Relations

There was an exchange of information on ecumenical relations committees set up by the churches, including the Council of Inter-Church Relations and the Council of Ecumenical Co-operation of the Church of England and a Commission on Ecumenical Consultation set up by the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church in the United States. A report was given of the discussions between the United Church of Christ in the U.S.A. and the Evangelical Church of the Union in Germany and other inter-church talks. It was agreed that a regular exchange of this type of information would be useful.

7. REGIONAL EXTENSION

(a) East Asia Christian Conference

Principal CHANDRAN reported on the Assembly of the EACC held at Kuala Lumpur, Malaya in May. He had been elected Chairman of the Committee on the Life, Message and Unity of the Church which would be especially responsible for Faith and Order concerns.

(b) Faith and Order Office in the United States of America

The SECRETARY presented a report on his visit to the United States during the spring of 1959 in connection with the setting up of a Faith and Order program, a proposal which had come out of the Oberlin Conference in 1957. He made some observations on the ecumenical climate in the American churches and indicated the points on which he felt emphasis should be placed in future Faith and Order work in the American scene. There had been considerable hesitation in some quarters about bringing Faith and Order into a central place in the ecumenical movement in the United States. The setting up of this new program was a notable step forward and indicated that the American churches now had sufficient confidence in one another to expose their "irreconcilable differences" to ecumenical study and discussion in the traditional Faith and Order manner. It was hoped that close liason would be maintained with the Faith and Order program of the WCC and it was with that in mind that the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., which together with the American office of the WCC would be supervising the new project, had arranged for the new Director of Faith and Order Studies to attend this and other Faith and Order meetings in Europe during the summer.

The SECRETARY introduced the newly appointed Director, the Rev. William Norgren, and the CHAIRMAN welcomed him on behalf of the Committee. Mr. NORGREN explained the general lines of work which had been given to him, including responsibility for interpreting the present concerns and activities of the Commission on Faith and Order.

In commenting on the observation of both the Secretary and Mr. Norgren that there was considerable resistance in America to the idea of church unity because it was tied up in people's minds with mammoth, overly-organized ecclesiastical bureaucracies, the CHAIRMAN said that it needed to be stressed again that the Faith and Order concern was for churchly unity at the local level and not for huge monolithic structures. He hoped that Mr. Norgren would help American church leaders to become aware of the existence of Faith and Order resources, particularly those which might be of use in church union negotiations.

8. ROMAN CATHOLIC RELATIONS

Dr. HARMS presented a survey of the present situation. There were so many and such complicated trends it was difficult to summarize them. A number of signs were evident in the Roman Church of the desire for more contacts, especially at the level of common study, and it was hoped that this might be taken up more effectively than in the past. There had been, of course, much wild speculation on the Ecumenical Council proposed by the Pope. It seemed likely that participation would be limited to Roman Catholics, and the question of church unity dealt

with primarily in that domestic context ; considering the lack of contact with other parts of Christendom of many Roman circles it was perhaps better for the ultimate cause of church unity that no more was attempted at this time. The Roman Church, was probably not prepared theologically or otherwise to make the right ecumenical decisions now. Many administrative problems were also involved in the general preparations, which meant that the Council would be convened much later than originally thought in some circles. The cautious and sober statement of the WCC Executive in February, which some Roman Catholics had wrongly interpreted as a sign of unwillingness to cooperate with them, was appropriate in the light of these developments. At the same time it was apparent that this initiative for a Council had come out of a genuine pastoral concern of the Pope for Christian unity and that the whole discussion was accelerating the already existing ferment of renewal and reform in the Roman Catholic Church. As to what Faith and Order might do in this situation, Dr. Harms suggested constant prayer for our Roman brethren at this time and a constant willingness to enter into discussion when opportunities were presented.

Prof. FLOROVSKY said that it was important to notice the process of change and reformation in the Roman Church. While these were not all obvious at the moment they might have important consequences for the future. He spoke of the "reform through scholarship" in the new studies on tradition, as well as the reinterpretation of the Council of Trent, and said it was of such a profound character it might well be considered a kind of reformation. In the Orthodox Church there was also an important reassessment taking place in the consideration of the question : "What *is* the Roman Church ?" In the past some had affirmed that Roman Catholics were not Christians at all and had repudiated the validity of Roman Baptism. Many Orthodox have modified these extreme views, but even among those who had accepted Roman Catholics as Christians there was not a general theological consensus on what the Roman Church was. This task of reappraisal was a crucial one in Orthodoxy and one in which Faith and Order could give significant help.

In the discussion on what Faith and Order could do in its relations with Roman Catholics in view of these developments, it was suggested that each Theological Commission might consider inviting Roman Catholic scholars to collaborate in its work and attend their meetings when it seemed appropriate. Prof. HARTFORD expressed appreciation for the perceptive commentary on the work of Faith and Order which was contained in a letter from a Roman Catholic friend which had been shared with the Committee. It was agreed that the possibility of having one or two Roman Catholic observers at the meeting of the Commission in 1960 should be investigated. The SECRETARY reported on the plans of the Lutheran World Federation for an interconfessional research program specializing in Roman Catholic relations. Prof. SCHLINK described the series of meetings between Lutheran and Roman Catholic theologians in Germany and expressed the hope for extending this type of theological meeting through Faith and Order.

9. WEEK OF PRAYER

The SECRETARY reported a spectacular increase in the use of the Faith and Order Week of Prayer leaflet ; the circulation had increased over ten-fold since 1957. In 1959 it had been printed in French for the first time and every year

there were new translations being printed and distributed in all parts of the world. The British Council of Churches was planning a printing of over 100,000 for the English version alone in 1960. It was suggested that greater use might generally be made of national Christian councils and councils of churches for translating and distributing the leaflet. Dr. HARMS reported that discussions were going on in the Evangelical Alliance to change the date of its Week of Prayer from January to the week preceding Pentecost, which would avoid some of the complications arising at present from the close proximity of the two observances in January.

10. FAITH AND ORDER RESEARCH

The SECRETARY asked the Committee to consider the possibility of setting up a Faith and Order research program. He believed that it would be feasible to draw together each year a group of four or five research fellows to work together on various Faith and Order issues. This could be done in collaboration with the WCC Scholarship Committee and the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey. Theologians on sabbatical leave might be interested in using their time in concentrated ecumenical research in Geneva. Prof. OUTLER expressed some hesitation about the financial and administrative complications. Prof. SCHLINK welcomed the idea but wondered if the library facilities in Geneva would be adequate. The Committee agreed that further consideration should be given to this project and that the Secretary should report back next year on the result of his investigations.

Dean NELSON raised the question of how research at present carried on in university theological faculties and seminaries might be related to Faith and Order study. It was suggested that a list of topics for special research which would be relevant to Faith and Order work might be printed occasionally in the *Ecumenical Review*. It was also suggested that contact should be made with the ecumenical fellowship programme at Union Theological Seminary in New York.

11. MADAGASCAR INVITATION

The SECRETARY reported that an invitation had been received from the Church Union Committee for North Madagascar to send a Faith and Order visiting team as consultants for their next meeting in October. Prof. D'Espine and Dr. Norman Goodall, who was present for this discussion, had agreed to go if this were acceptable to the Working Committee. Dr. GOODALL explained some of the background of the union negotiations in Madagascar and the reasons why the Union Committee had requested the help of Faith and Order. Three groups were involved: the churches related to the London Missionary Society, the Paris Mission, and the British Society of Friends. Negotiations had begun in 1950 and had now reached a crucial stage.

Prof. D'ESPINE expressed his willingness to go but said that, considering the delicate nature of the mission and the fact that this would be the first time that Faith and Order had undertaken such a visit, he wished precise instructions from the Working Committee on what kind of help might be given.

Dr. PAYNE said that this was a historic moment in the life of Faith and Order. The only instructions which they were able to give were the safeguards in the

Faith and Order Constitution. It would be hoped that the delegation might explore how far such visits are helpful or an embarrassment to the negotiating churches and report back to the Working Committee and Commission next year.

The CHAIRMAN summed up the discussion by saying that the visitors should limit themselves to answering and asking questions, in the light of Faith and Order theological and biblical studies related to the issues under consideration and in the light of experience drawn from other union negotiations. It was this accumulated experience which the Faith and Order delegation could represent and could contribute to the Union Committee. The Committee wished them well on their journey.

The question of finance was considered, this project being outside the ordinary working budget of Faith and Order. It was agreed to : i) record with gratitude the generosity of the IMC in paying the expenses of Dr. Goodall ; and ii) pay the expenses of Prof. D'Espine from the special Faith and Order fund for regional consultations, unless it proved possible to secure a contribution from other outside sources. It was agreed on a motion of Dr. Payne that a sum not exceeding \$1000.— be drawn, if necessary, from the fund for regional consultations towards the expenses of this delegation.

12. PRESENTATION OF FAITH AND ORDER AT WCC THIRD ASSEMBLY

The CHAIRMAN explained that Faith and Order would be given one full plenary session in which to present its work. It was decided it would be preferable to treat one theme fully rather than try to give a comprehensive survey of the whole program of Faith and Order. It was suggested by the SECRETARY that this might be done by showing how, in the context of one church union negotiation (preferably Asian), the work of the Faith and Order Theological Commissions fitted in. A general survey could best be done through a written report for the Assembly delegates as well as for the churches at large.

It was agreed : i) to authorize the publication of a small volume summarizing the work of Faith and Order ; ii) that the presentation of Faith and Order at the Third Assembly in a plenary session should take the form of a presentation by someone illustrating how the insights of Faith and Order work themselves out in a concrete church union, followed by a "preacher" who would seek to get across the Lund christological insight that it is through the centre that unity is realized. Several suggestions were made of speakers who might do this effectively.

13. FAITH AND ORDER CONCERNS OF THE YOUTH DEPARTMENT

The Rev. Philip POTTER, Executive Secretary of the WCC Youth Department, gave a report on the Faith and Order issues raised in the work of his department. One of the most urgent questions coming up was that of Confirmation : why do so many youth leave the churches after Confirmation ? There were indications that the fundamental meaning of the Sacraments was not adequately understood by many youth. The Youth Department was planning a "Faith and Order Consultation" on Holy Communion, along the same lines as the

one held on Baptism in 1958. The Secretary of Faith and Order would be one of the leaders in this Consultation. The members of the Committee expressed appreciation of the report and suggested that similar reports be made to the Working Committee from time to time.

14. PLANS FOR 1960 FAITH AND ORDER COMMISSION MEETING

The SECRETARY reported on the plans for the 1960 meeting of the Faith and Order Commission, to be held in St. Andrews, Scotland in conjunction with other WCC meetings. Dr. BILHEIMER reported the proposed dates for the WCC Executive and Central Committees and for the Working Committees. The Committee agreed to suggest the dates August 2nd (evening) to August 9th (morning) for the Commission, and a Consultation on Church Union to follow on August 9th and 10th. The Working Committee would plan to have a short meeting at the beginning before the Commission assembled. These dates would be adjusted and finalized at the Central Committee in Rhodes.

It was proposed that Prof. Leonard Hodgson be invited to attend as an observer. It was also suggested that arrangements be made for youth consultants as at previous Commission meetings. In addition to a major discussion on Baptism it was suggested that time be found for a discussion of Faith and Order issues arising out of the work of other WCC departments and it was noted that the Laity Department in particular had expressed interest in such a dialogue.

15. REVISION OF THE WCC BASIS

Dr. PAYNE reported that a sub-committee of the Central Committee had been working on a revision of the Basis of the WCC since the last Assembly. It was thought that Faith and Order might be asked by the Central Committee to set up an advisory group to give guidance to the WCC on this question. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that provision could be made for this under the Faith and Order Constitution.

16. ELECTIONS

The CHAIRMAN announced that Bishop Newbiggin had formally tendered his resignation as Vice-Chairman of the Commission on his appointment as General Secretary of the International Missionary Council. This was received with great regret by the Committee and deep appreciation was expressed to Bishop Newbiggin for his contributions to the work of Faith and Order.

Prof. Henri D'Espine of Geneva was elected by unanimous vote as the new Vice-Chairman.

Dean J. R. Nelson of Nashville was elected a member of the Working Committee by unanimous vote.

The CHAIRMAN closed the meeting with prayer and the Working Committee went into private executive session to consider staff proposals.

SECOND REPORT

to the Central Committee of the Working Committee of Faith and Order on the Future of Faith and Order

The Faith and Order movement was born in the hope that it would be, under God, a help to the "churches" in realizing His will for the unity of the Church. The formation of the World Council of Churches, and the incorporation of Faith and Order in it, have changed the circumstances under which Faith and Order works, but have not changed its purpose. We have become convinced that the time has come for a re-affirmation of this purpose, and for a re-examination of the means by which Faith and Order should, within the World Council of Churches, seek its realization.

We believe that the unity which is both God's will and His gift to His Church is one which brings all in each place * who confess Christ Jesus as Lord into a fully committed fellowship with one another through one baptism into Him, preaching the one Gospel and breaking the one bread, and having a corporate life reaching out in witness and service to all; and which at the same time unites them with the whole Christian fellowship in all places and all ages in such wise that ministry and members are acknowledged by all, and that all can act and speak together as occasion requires for the tasks to which God calls the Church.

It is for such true *churchly* unity that we believe we and all the World Council must pray and work. Such a vision has indeed been the inspiration of the Faith and Order movement in the past, and we re-affirm that this is still our goal. We recognize that the brief definition of our objective which we have given above leaves many questions unanswered. We can see that its achievement involves nothing less than a death and rebirth for many forms of church life as we have known them. We believe that nothing less costly can finally suffice.

Having re-examined the tasks assigned to us in our Constitution, our place in the World Council and our ways of working, we now submit the following considerations and recommendations whereby we believe that we can best fulfil our responsibilities at this point in our history.

A. Scrutiny and re-assessment of our "functions" as set out in the Constitution of Faith and Order

- (i) "To proclaim the essential oneness of the Church of Christ and to keep prominently before the World Council and the Churches the obligation to manifest that unity and its urgency for the work of evangelism"

It is our strong conviction that to proclaim the essential oneness of the Church of Christ involves facing the question "what kind of unity does God demand of His Church?" We agree that no one definition of the nature of unity can be a condition of membership in the WCC, but Faith and Order exists in order to stand for the unity of the Church as the will of God and for a ceaseless effort to know what obedience to that will means concretely. Only so can it be "manifest." The WCC can have no "neutrality" on whether that question is answered or not. Clearly the World Council is not in a position to say what the answer is in all its fullness; if it were, our quest for the "man-

* The word "place" here is used both in its primary sense of local neighbourhood and also, under more modern conditions, of other areas in which Christians need to express unity in Christ, e. g. all those engaged in a local industry.

ifest unity" would already be at an end. As the Toronto Statement of 1950 put it : "As the conversation between the Churches develops, and as the Churches enter into closer contact with each other, they will no doubt have to face new decisions and problems. For the Council exists to break the deadlock between the Churches." (*ibid.* V. 2.) All the churches in the Council confront each other under the demand of God Himself that they should learn from Him the nature of the unity which we seek. It has been characteristic of Faith and Order to recognize that patience and thoroughness are needed for this task. But it is also necessary to recognize that in such matters we are not entirely free to proceed at our own pace, that events are forcing upon us various kinds of Christian co-operation, and that if we do not find true churchly unity we shall find ourselves remaining content with a form of organizational unity which leaves unfulfilled many of the central requirements of the Church's life. There is therefore need for a proper sense of urgency lest we lose the time that God gives us. Faith and Order must constantly press upon the Council and the churches the fact that the question of unity is one upon which an answer has to be given, and that to give no answer means to be shut up to the wrong answer. Specifically, Faith and Order must raise this question

- (a) in Assemblies so far as its programme for the whole WCC allows ;
- (b) in Central Committee from time to time as best serves, as well as in the Theological Commissions which all at least bear upon the answer.

All these are ways in which Faith and Order makes its witness within the WCC, but in order ultimately to reach the churches themselves, for whose sake all this activity is organized.

But within the Council, bearing in mind the WCC Constitution, it is also important that every department should be concerned that unity is borne in mind as it does its work, and we would hope that the WCC secretariat would, from time to time, ask how far their respective departments are contributing to the fullness of unity.

As plans for the integration with the International Missionary Council proceed, the relation of mission and unity should be more clearly seen. We would ask that national Christian councils and councils of churches should be asked whether their work also makes provision for Faith and Order, so that this connection may be brought home in every region.

As our churches seek to obey God in the renewal of their confessional and liturgical life, and in promoting its mission, they will be deaf to what God is saying to them in our day if they do not, constantly and specifically, seek His guidance in how to translate all aspects of renewal and mission into manifestation of greater and growing unity.

Finally, in all this we must bring home the truth that our present differences and divisions hinder the mission and renewal of the Church and may obscure, even if they do not actually contradict, the Gospel of reconciliation.

- (ii) "To study questions of faith, order and worship with the relevant social, cultural, political, racial and other factors in their bearing on the unity of the Church"

The content of our studies is of fundamental importance, and our first concern must be to ensure that Faith and Order is fully sensitive to the real questions which the churches are asking, and to questions which are yet scarcely articulate, so that its study is vitally related to their real needs. Study can be carried out in a great variety of ways. The traditional Faith and Order Theological Commission has a definite role where long-term co-operative study is needed. A serious question arises about the destination of such studies. We would distinguish today between :

- (a) WCC Assemblies for
 - (i) Faith and Order witness at the heart of the WCC ;
 - (ii) Communicating certain fruits of study.

Certain aspects of Theological Commissions' responsibilities can be discharged thus.

(b) *Special Faith and Order Conferences* (including world conferences) will also certainly be needed, because only in gatherings primarily concerned with Faith and Order issues is it possible for the fruits of preceding research to be fully shared, for there to be specific debate on the questions studied in the smaller groups of the Theological Commissions and for the themes for future study to emerge from the give-and-take of representative yet concentrated conference.

(c) Direct contact with the churches by the influence of delegates, staff visitation and correspondence, and by a careful programme for the dissemination of published material, both direct and through the churches and national councils.

But the Theological Commissions are by no means the only *method* of study nor existing themes its only *content*. Different *methods* suit different contents — e.g. field research, the short series of *ad hoc* conferences, regional enquiry on specific issues, fostering pilot-experiments in local groups, provision for theological faculties and other such special agencies to pay attention, as part of their own responsibilities, to Faith and Order issues.

Content is often also suggested by other Departments of the WCC. Faith and Order must be flexible to respond to such calls. E. g. the relation to unity of current discussions in other Departments, on the role of the laity and on the ordination of women.

The ability to respond quickly to co-operation with other aspects of the WCC is indispensable if Faith and Order is to be, and to be felt to be, the organ of the WCC through which problems bearing upon the unity of the Church can be effectively dealt with when they reach the WCC from its member churches from any quarter whatsoever. It is clear that Faith and Order is not an oracle to *answer* all sorts of such questions, but it is the forum in which they can receive prompt and well-qualified consideration in a full ecumenical setting and in which the accumulation of experience of ecumenical work can be brought to bear upon them.

(iii) "To study the theological implications of the existence of the ecumenical movement"

The ecumenical movement in so far as it can rightly be called "the great new fact of our era" presents us with a work of God through His Spirit which we must seek to understand and interpret in our own generation. This is an aspect of the total "Mystery of the Church," but it contains specific issues sufficient to make it a distinguishable activity from (i) above, especially in the theological interpretation of such a fact as the WCC itself which, though it is not the Church, is certainly not unrelated to the Church and contains its own significance as a form of Christian unity which needs to be kept under theological scrutiny. The work begun by the Central Committee at Toronto in 1950 initiated a process which Faith and Order should feel a special responsibility to continue and to extend, for the sake both of those within the WCC and those beyond its membership.

(iv) "To study matters in the present relationships of the Churches to one another which cause difficulties and need theological clarification"

This function is not easily defined. One of its original consequences was a study of proselytism (later taken over by the Central Committee). But we believe that it marks out a territory of concrete and specific enquiries for which Faith and Order shall continue to be responsible.

(v) "To provide information concerning actual steps taken by the Churches towards reunion"

The furnishing of the churches with an accurate and up-to-date information service on re-union negotiations, and the research implied in collecting it, is a service in the direct line of Faith and Order interests which ought certainly to be fulfilled. Although we appreciate the extent to which the secretariat has been able to carry this out in recent years, we are convinced that it could only be done effectively if greater resources of staff were available.

As we have scrutinized these functions as defined in our present constitution, we wish to re-affirm our adherence to them, and to see them carried out with vigour. But we feel that the experience of the years since the Constitution was drafted would make us want to re-state them for the future with some change of emphasis, expression and arrangement. Pending an appropriate moment for the revision of our Constitution, we content ourselves with this commentary upon their meaning.

B. Some further implications in our work

We would go on to urge certain other concerns which we believe we are called by God to undertake, which, although not specifically indicated in our present terms of reference, are in keeping with the spirit and tradition of the Faith and Order movement.

(1) *Unity negotiations*

One of the striking consequences of nearly 50 years of Faith and Order work has been the creation of an atmosphere in which churches have been able to pass on from the discussion of unity in principle to negotiate concrete local unions. Nothing should impair the freedom of the churches themselves in this matter. But we would re-emphasize Constitution 4 (iv) * as meaning in our day that part of the "service" of Faith and Order must be to take a far more active attitude towards the various plans for unity without itself, of course, ever being the sponsor of any specific plan. But we believe we could and should serve the churches by:

(a) providing for "consultations" as part of our own programme in which representatives of churches engaged in union negotiation could meet with each other and with a wide circle of those interested, to learn from each other and to see their own negotiations in a wider context. The gratitude expressed for the "unofficial consultations" already held encourages us to make them in future a more direct responsibility of Faith and Order whenever its own meetings draw together a widely representative gathering which includes such interests.

(b) Analyzing the various schemes in current discussion, with a view to discovering the bearing which each may have on other negotiations and the solutions of difficulties found in them which may be useful to other churches discussing union.

(c) If inter-church consultations of the kind contemplated in paragraph (a) above should lead to invitations to the Faith and Order Commission to assist at any point in unity negotiations, the officers of the Commission should regard themselves as empowered to appoint Commission members or members of theological sub-commissions or the Secretary to the Commission to accept the invitations, subject to conformity to the general policy of the Commission. The officers should also be ready to provide relevant material from the experience of the Commission. It is hoped that this readiness to render any assistance called for will become known to the churches.

(2) *Regional Work and other Meetings* which are less than fully comprehensive Faith and Order Conferences. By an action of the Faith and Order Working Committee at Davos in 1955, endorsed by the Central Committee in the same year, the Faith and Order Commission is already free to interpret Para. 4 of its Constitution as allowing meetings which are not based on invitations "addressed to Christian Churches throughout the world."

The success of the New Zealand and Oberlin Conferences, of the Lutheran-Reformed meetings in Europe, and the Indian regional conference, leads us to mention here gatherings of this kind as being in future part of our regular concern. In particular we would hope that many groups who find themselves in a small minority at our normal confer-

* "(iv) Only churches themselves are competent to take actual steps towards reunion by entering into negotiations with one another. The work of the movement is not to formulate schemes and tell the churches what they ought to do, but to act as the handmaid of the churches in the preparatory work of clearing away misunderstandings, discussing obstacles to reunion, and issuing reports which are submitted to the churches for their consideration."

ences could sometimes be afforded opportunities to meet in a setting in which they would be relieved of some of the disadvantages and inhibitions of appearing always as a minority.

We would also consider whether other groups than churches actually negotiating should be drawn into contact with each other — e.g. churches resulting from union-negotiations to meet with representatives from some of the world confessional organizations with which their component churches are related ; or, certain churches in a particular area be invited to enter into conversation on Faith and Order themes.

In this context, we would like to stress the value of active Faith and Order departments in national Christian councils and councils of churches, with which the Faith and Order secretariat is glad to co-operate. Local pilot-schemes of study, under Faith and Order auspices, could occasionally be arranged in consultation with the national council concerned.

(3) *Relations with Christians outside the WCC membership*

One of our basic principles is to draw churches out of isolation into conference. In this connection, we believe that we have a responsibility, in this time in which our member churches have been able to overcome that isolation by meeting in the WCC, especially towards those churches which have chosen not to avail themselves of that particular opportunity. We also note that we are empowered to invite representatives of such churches to serve in our Commission (v. Constitution, par. 5 (ii) b), and so, by implication, on our Theological Commissions.

We have especially in mind two groups among those who "accept Our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour."

(a) *The Roman Catholic Church* constitutes so large and serious a part of Christendom that we are bound to take it into consideration in our work for Christian unity. But we realize the very serious difficulties which arise, both from their side and from ours, to hinder any official or clearly defined relationship. Yet Faith and Order is an aspect of the WCC in which the Roman Catholic Church has shown an interest. Roman Catholic theologians have made important contributions by their writings to the discussion of Faith and Order issues. We believe that this theological discussion should be pursued in whatever ways may be mutually acceptable.

(b) *Protestant Churches* outside the WCC need another form of approach, for as compared with the unity (though complex) of the Roman Catholic Church, we are here dealing with very diverse entities. But we believe that many of them are ready to enter into common study with the WCC and to meet in personal contact in various countries and regions. They comprise another group of fellow-Christians with whom Faith and Order should enter into fellowship on the ground of common concern for Christian mission and unity.

With regard to them both, we would urge that Faith and Order should :

- (i) aim at a situation in the WCC staff which ensured that there should always be people sufficiently free from other commitments to make a first charge on their time to be in continuous, personal and well-informed contact with the whole complexity of both these groups ;
- (ii) on the basis of such contact, the Faith and Order Secretariat, Working Committee and other groups in Faith and Order would be in a position to be kept informed of developments and openings, and so able to seek their participation in our theological work where it was then deemed possible and advisable.

C. Consequences for Organization

Our deepest concern is that the World Council as a whole should always serve that *churchly* unity into which God calls His People to be reconciled through His Son. As partial consequences of responding to that call, our separated churches have found in the WCC an organ through which to do many things together, and for all of this we give thanks to God. We believe that all the tasks we have outlined, and others

which we trust that He will show us, together constitute a central part of the Council's work, and an ingredient in the whole which keeps all our churches aware of the full unity of Word and Sacrament, Ministry and Mission, in universal and local fellowship.

We believe that in order for the World Council as a whole to be this effective organ in the cause of churchly unity, Faith and Order should be at the centre of its life and a major element in its organizational structure. We fully recognize that the WCC is a complex organism which has total problems of finance and structural development and has many concerns to reckon with. The Constitution of the World Council itself, however, makes it clear that Faith and Order is to have a peculiarly central position in its life: "The functions of the World Council shall be: (i) to carry on the work of the world movements for Faith and Order and for Life and Work... The World Council shall discharge part of its functions by the appointment of Commissions... There shall be a Faith and Order Commission..." It is our conviction that not only to enable Faith and Order to accomplish its specific tasks within the total work of the WCC, and, more particularly, to promote the original intention of the founding of the WCC that the concern for churchly unity should be at the very heart of its life and penetrate all of its activities, the structural position of Faith and Order in the organization of the WCC needs to be reinforced as well as its staff and financial resources strengthened.

Considering the original purposes of the WCC as outlined in the Constitution, the following proposals are considered by this Committee not to involve any radical change in the relation of Faith and Order to the WCC but simply a logical development of a pattern which is already provided for in the Constitution and a natural strengthening of Faith and Order within the WCC commensurate with the growth and development of the World Council itself in recent years.

The Working Committee has examined not only the role of the Faith and Order Commission within the WCC but also the internal organization of the Faith and Order Commission itself. In this connection we believe it to be necessary to clarify the meaning and implications of membership in the Faith and Order Commission. Each member should be given a clear understanding of his responsibilities towards the Faith and Order Commission and towards his own Church; and leaders of churches should be fully cognizant of the fact that they are represented in the Faith and Order Commission so that they may be disposed to appropriate the experience of such members and give them due support. Moreover it may prove necessary to re-examine the manner in which members are added to the Faith and Order Commission in the light of requirements imposed by its future tasks.

Our discussion on the future of Faith and Order carried on now for three years and comments received on our Interim Report have made clear that the following provisions should be made:

(1) The place of Faith and Order as a constituent Commission of the WCC, as provided for in the WCC Constitution, should be clarified so that it has a status and position appropriate to the central importance of the concern for church unity in the life of the WCC. The Working Committee has given earnest consideration as to how this may be achieved, including the specific suggestion that Faith and Order take the form of a Division after the next Assembly. We are, of course, aware of certain serious difficulties which this raises, and we recognize that the Central Committee must weigh this problem in the light of the overall situation and decide what may be recommended to the Faith and Order Commission and submitted to the Assembly. We therefore request the Committee to consider this suggestion or others which may occur to the Committee, and to respond with its advice as to the ways and means by which the concerns of Faith and Order may best be realized. Whatever decision is taken about the place of Faith and Order in the structure of the WCC, close liaison should be maintained in the realm of study with other departments through the Staff Co-ordinating Committee on Study in which all WCC departments are represented.

(2) There should be a report to the Central Committee every year, prepared by the Faith and Order Working Committee, on current issues and developments in the field of Christian unity.

(3) There should continue to be made in every WCC Assembly the same generous provision as has been allowed hitherto for discussion upon issues of unity.

(4) World Conferences specifically on Faith and Order have an irreplaceable role and provision needs to be made for them from time to time.

(5) The programme we have outlined above also clearly implies a larger staff than is at present available. The distribution and character of the work to be done depends upon the qualities of the persons involved. The Faith and Order staff should always represent in themselves as wide a range as possible of confessional and national traditions. The programme outlined in the earlier part of this report would fully occupy a staff of four, whose duties could be illustrated in such a picture as this :

a) *Director of the Commission on Faith and Order*, who would be responsible for carrying out general strategy of Faith and Order work as well as being intimately involved in the working out of general WCC policy at the highest level. He would be responsible for the general co-ordination of the Faith and Order program. He would also be particularly concerned with the extension of Faith and Order activities in new areas as well as having general oversight over the consultative service for church union negotiations. He would also have special responsibility for these suggested contacts with non-member churches.

b) *Executive Secretary*, who would be responsible for the continuing programme of Faith and Order as carried on through the Faith and Order Commission, the long-term Theological Commissions, and for the general administration involved in these as well as for Conferences and Consultations, and for promotion of Faith and Order studies among the member churches.

c) *Research Secretary*, who would carry on special research and survey projects, and in particular would be responsible for surveys, both factual and analytical, of church union schemes.

d) *Editorial Secretary*, who would have responsibility for documentation, translation, publications, and maintaining archives, as well as for the general promotion of the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity and the preparation and distribution of the Week of Prayer materials.

(6) The Director of Faith and Order needs to have the closest relationship with the WCC General Secretariat, and to be fully involved in the total work of the WCC should be one of the Associate General Secretaries.

We believe that in these ways Faith and Order would be more clearly seen to occupy a place in the structure of the WCC which properly reflects its central and fundamental role in the whole ecumenical movement.

* * *

The earlier part of this report is substantially the same as the Interim Report presented to the Central Committee at Nyborg Strand in 1958. Section C represents the considered views of the Working Committee on the practical needs if the full programme set out earlier is to be implemented. No part of the Report has yet been before the Faith and Order Commission, but it will be submitted in the summer of 1960, prior to the next meeting of the Central Committee. We submit the present report direct to the Central Committee at this time because :

(1) We have been informed of the Interim Report of the Programme and Finance Committee and of its recommendation that no substantial changes in the structure of the WCC be envisaged at the Third Assembly other than those involved in the integration of the WCC and IMC. We hope that the Programme and Finance Committee will be willing to give further study to the considerations set out in this report.

(2) We are concerned about the effective carrying forward of the work of Faith and Order at the present time, and are not happy that things should be left as they are until the Third Assembly. Whilst realizing the many practical difficulties, we hope that the Central Committee will request the Executive and the Secretariat to give immediate consideration to this question.

(1) Report of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church (European Section)

1. *Membership of the Commission*

Dr. G. W. Bromiley, formerly secretary of the Commission, resigned on removal to the U.S.A. Dr. G. R. Beasley-Murray was elected secretary in his place.

In the meeting of the Commission at Lund, 30th July 1958, it was resolved, "A New Testament scholar should be invited for one particular session, and then if necessary be invited to join the Commission later."

2. *Papers presented to the Commission*

- (i) Professor Torrance : a) "Israel and the Church."
b) "What is the Church?"
- (ii) G. R. Beasley-Murray : "Summary of Cullmann's *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*."
- (iii) Prof. Niebuhr, "The Church defines itself in the World."
- (iv) Prof. Welch — (book) — "The Reality of the Church."

The above were considered at the meeting of the Commission at Lund 1958. Since then a further paper has been circulated :

- (v) Prof. Minear, "Extracts from Essays presented to the European Section of the Commission on Christ and the Church, 1955-1958."

A similar paper was received from the American Section of the Commission :

- (vi) Prof. Welch, "Extracts from papers and discussions of the American Section of the Commission on Christ and the Church, 1955-1958."
- (vii) A summary of the findings of the Commission to date, and an indication of matters requiring further study.

3. *Summary of the Meeting at Lund, July 1958*

- (i) Discussion on Christology and (more particularly) on the Church, were held on the basis of the papers mentioned in Section 2, i-iv.
- (ii) The Memorandum on the Unity of Baptism, drawn up by the Faith and Order Commission meeting at New Haven, commenting on and criticising the Working Paper on Baptism produced by the European meeting in Holland of 1957, was read and discussed.
- (iii) In the light of this discussion a subcommittee presented a draft document, embodying features which it was believed ought to find a place in the report on baptism which the 1959 meeting of the commission must produce.
- (iv) A subcommittee discussed the future of Faith and Order and made recommendations with respect to this.
- (v) The outstanding points of agreement, to which it was felt the commission had been tending, and outstanding matters of disagreement, were outlined in a document circulated by Dr. Bridston to the members of the commission, dated Sept. 1958 and there is no necessity to reproduce them again in this report. It may be observed, however, that the divergences of view and difficulties in respect to the doctrine of baptism were lightly touched on in this document. The reality and depth of the differences (and difficulties) are illustrated in the difference of viewpoints expressed in the Working Paper of 1957 and the New Haven memorandum that criticises it. These will have to be faced boldly at the 1959 meeting in Tutzing.

4. *Future plans*

- (i) A Joint Meeting of the European and American Sections of the Commission is to be held at the Schloss Tutzing in July 1959. The programme for this meeting is to include :
- (a) A review of past work.
 - (b) A discussion of future plans for both sections of the Commission.
 - (c) Further discussion on Baptism (as long as possible).
 - (d) A discussion on the Holy Spirit.
 - (e) The writing of the interim report for the 1960 meeting of the full Commission on Faith and Order.

To assist the production of this report the Chairman is to draw up a document embodying findings thus far and presenting our task in clear perspective.

- (ii) For the 1960 meeting of the European section two questions are proposed for discussion :
- (a) The Holy Spirit's work in the Church.
 - (b) Apostolic Succession — in the light of a paper by Mr. Nicholls: "The Church and the Historical Jesus," the VELKD declaration on Apostolic Succession and Montefiore's paper commenting on it ; and Professor Schlink's book, "Apostolic Succession."

(2) Report of the Theological Commission on Worship

(East Asia)

At the First Assembly of the East Asia Christian Conference in Kuala Lumpur, Malaya, in May 1959, a small group met together to consider ways of producing at least a provisional report of the East Asia Commission on Worship before 1960. The group consisted of Dr. G. P. Charles of Burma, the Rev. Harold de Soysa and the Rev. S. Selvaretnam of Ceylon, Dr. A. N. Gopal, the Rev. M. V. George, the Rt. Rev. Alexander Mar Theophilus and Principal J. R. Chandran from India, Dr. C. L. Abineno from Indonesia, Dr. Takashi Muto from Japan, and the Rev. O. C. Fonseca from the Philippines. It was decided that within the next 8 months statements should be prepared from the different Asian countries dealing with the following points :

- (a) A factual statement of liturgical developments in the different churches indicating the influence of Church Union on new liturgies ;
- (b) Accounts of any special study made by individuals or groups on worship.
- (c) Accounts of experiments on indigenisation of worship, particularly dealing with the influence of indigenisation on Church music, Church calendar etc.
- (d) Materials available for family worship, private devotions, etc.
- (e) Bibliography of books and articles published in the country on Worship.

We also suggested some names in each country to be responsible for preparing this statement. Finally the material will be put together and edited by the officers of the Commission. This will be somewhat of a survey rather than theological discussion by the Churches, but it will provide material for conversations between Churches.

(3) Report of the Theological Commission on Worship

(Europe)

Since last summer there have been two meetings of this section, one at Lincoln, England, from October 20 to 24, 1958, and one at Heidelberg, Germany, from April 3 to 8, 1959. The minutes of the former have been circulated ; those of the latter are being prepared.

Membership

No resignations. It is desired that Professor Boris Bobrinskoy (who attended the Heidelberg meeting) and Professor Claus Westermann (who is understood to be willing) should be appointed as members; this will make up 15.

Papers read

- Lincoln : Professor PRENTER : Worship and Creation.
Dr. VAJTA : Creation and Worship.
Professor RIESENFELD : Worship and the Cross.
Professor VON ALLMEN : Le Saint-Esprit et le Culte.
Professor HAHN : Gottesdienst und Wortverkündigung.
- Heidelberg : Professor BOBRINSKOY : Ascension et Culte.
Professor BOSCH : L'Ascension et la Souveraine prêtrise du Christ en relation avec le Culte.

Future Plans

Meetings arranged for April 23 to 29, 1960, and probably April 15 to 20, 1961.

Papers to be read in 1960 :

- Professor WESTERMANN : Sunday, Day of the Lord.
Professor HAHN : Prolegomena to a Theology of Worship.
THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN : Public Worship, Private Devotion and Daily Life.

Much time was devoted at Heidelberg to a discussion of future plans for the drawing up of a report. The document circulated entitled "Rough List of Topics Considered" shows the ground already covered (apart from the Heidelberg meeting itself), and gives references to the places in papers and minutes and other memoranda where the various topics are discussed. It was decided that it would be necessary to go over all the material again and draw up short theses, showing points of agreement, points of disagreement, and points where we might learn from each other. After much discussion it was agreed to divide the material provisionally according to the articles of the creed, and members were appointed to prepare material under these headings. Professor Rütty, Archdeacon Cobham, and Professor Prenter were appointed to take charge of the material relating to the first, second and third articles respectively. It is intended to devote the meeting in 1960 largely to the three papers arranged, but also to make a start on considering theses suitable for inclusion in the final report, and to devote the meetings of 1961 and 1962 to a fuller consideration of the report.

A session of the Heidelberg meeting was devoted to exchanging news of the recent liturgical developments in the various countries represented. This was of great interest, and it was decided to devote further sessions to this.

Comment on Dr. Bridston's proposal

It will be remembered that through a series of unfortunate accidents this section was very late in starting work and in fact has held only one meeting before the two mentioned above. It would thus be far more difficult for this section than for most of the other sections and other commissions to produce a report by 1961. We shall do our best to comply with any request that is made to us; and from the considerable material which we have accumulated it would no doubt be possible to compose some kind of interim statement; but to produce a draft which had been adequately discussed by the members would be extremely difficult.

On the question of a joint meeting with the American and East Asian sections, the meeting at Lincoln reached this conclusion (Lincoln Minutes, p. 19): "It was decided that in view of the slow start of the Commission's work, it was not practicable to arrange joint meetings with the other sections, so that the final report would have to be in three parts; but that when it was possible for individuals to attend meetings of sections other

than their own, this should be encouraged." The meeting at Heidelberg was of the same opinion. Here again we shall do our best to fall in with the general wishes, and should certainly welcome the attendance of members of the other sections at our meetings, but the preparation of a joint report would seem to present almost insuperable difficulties, especially in view of our late start and the fact that there has been very little contact between the sections.

Description of meetings

The main lines on which we have worked are largely indicated by the above. We have been much occupied with the creation, with sacrifice (on which a draft statement is attached to the Lincoln Minutes; this was recorded but not formally approved), and with the ascension. At Heidelberg our relation to the anti-liturgical and anti-cultic tendencies within the Church received new prominence, and Professor Hahn's proposed paper is to deal with the fundamental question why a theology of worship is needed. While our work so far has been diffuse and greatly needs the discipline which will be involved in writing the report and while our divisions have to some extent followed familiar denominational lines, yet there has been considerable advance to agreement; and we hope that, given time, we shall be able to speak a reconciling word on a number of issues.

(4) Report of the Theological Commission on Tradition and Traditions (American Section)

Our project has continued to evolve and to change shape on us in the course of the past five years, but our basic problem remains what it was to begin with: the identity and continuity of the Gospel and the Church in and through the vicissitudes of the Christian history and the pluralism of denominationalism. If there is such an identity and continuity, can it be discovered and identified in the diverse and divided histories of the churches? If so, how? If *the* Christian tradition is dynamically present, in one degree or other, in the multiform traditions of the churches, can it be related to the biblical witness on the one hand and to the changing contexts of the Church in society? We are all agreed that these are real and significant problems even if we do not yet agree as to their answers or even that they are fully answerable.

Our program is largely a historical-theological one — and this partly in view of the fact that the European Section has undertaken to study the problem in its biblical exegetical context. They are concerned to produce a biblical theology of tradition. We for our part are trying to survey and appraise the roles and functions of Tradition and traditions in the historical experience of the Christian community. Our project as it has developed finds a special focus in the particular experience of "transplanted" Christianity in North America and, similarly, in the "younger churches" of Southeast Asia, Africa and South America. Larger reference to this point may be found in our current Minutes.

At the present time our agenda looks something like this:

I. *Section I*

1. "The Biblical Perspective on Tradition and Traditions" — J. J. Pelikan,
2. "The Sense of Tradition in the Ante-Nicene Church" — A. C. Outler.
3. "The Problem of Tradition in the Age of the Ecumenical Council" — Georges Florovsky.
4. "The Reformers and Their Problem with Scripture and Tradition" — J. J. Pelikan.
5. "Tradition as a Problem for British Protestantism" (16th-18th Centuries) — D. W. Hay.

6. "The Problem of Tradition in Anglicanism — With Special Reference to the Issues and Implications of the Restoration Settlement of 1662" — E. R. Fairweather.
7. "The Problem of 'The Essence of Christianity' in 19th Century Protestantism" — W. Pauck.

II. Section II

1. "Christian Unity and National Unity in American Christianity" — W. C. Clebsch.
2. "Tradition in Transit and Tension in American Protestantism: Studies of In-Migrant Groups" — S. Ahlstrom.
3. "Tradition and Scripture as a Problem for Conservative Protestantism in America" (to be assigned).
4. "Transplanted Christianity in Canada" (to be assigned).
5. "The Experience of Roman Catholicism in America" (to be assigned).
6. "Traditionary Influences at Work in the Methodist, Congregational, and Presbyterian Union and Disunion of 1925 in Canada."

III. Section III

The papers in this Section are to consist of reports and observations on the problems of identity and continuity in the "transplanted" Christianity in the "younger churches" of Southeast Asia, Africa and South America. No specific topics have yet been formulated and no specific assignments have been made. This, as our Minutes will show, represents a new frontier in our interest and planning, and is still in the exploratory stage.

Of this agenda, completed papers have been submitted by Pelikan, Hay, Ahlstrom and Outler. A set of preliminary theses has been prepared by Clebsch — and discussed by the Commission. We have had detailed oral presentations by Fairweather and Florovsky. At the instigation of our Commission, the American Church History Society has devoted two of its meetings to the study of our topic, the Southwestern Theological Discussion Group has made it the subject of five of its meetings, and it has been the central theme of a series of "Church History Consultations" held throughout the United States this past year under the direction of Professor George Williams of Harvard and Professor Franklin Littell of Emory. Pelikan's paper has been published in *The Lutheran World* (December 1956). Outler has published a book, *The Christian Tradition and the Unity We Seek* (Oxford University Press, 1957).

The personnel of the Commission is as follows:

ALBERT C. OUTLER, Chairman
 GEORGES FLOROVSKY, Vice-Chairman
 D. W. HAY, Secretary
 S. E. AHLSTROM
 W. C. CLEBSCH
 E. R. FAIRWEATHER
 J. J. PELIKAN

We have lost WILHELM PAUCK and G. B. CAIRD by resignation.

The Commission has nominated the following persons to be new members of the Commission:

DR. PIERCE BEAVER, Professor of Missions, The Federated Theological Faculties, The University of Chicago, United Church of Christ.
 DR. DONALD M. MATHER, Professor of Church History, Queens Theological College, Kingston, Ontario. United Church of Canada.
 DR. H. H. WALSH, Professor of the Philosophy of Religion, Divinity Hall, McGill University, Montreal. Anglican Church of Canada.
 DR. GLENN ROUTH, Professor of Theology, Texas Christian University, The Disciples of Christ.

We also intend to invite Dr. Carl Henry or President E. J. Carnell to submit a paper on "The Problem of Tradition in Conservative Protestantism in America"; similarly, Father Walter J. Ong, S. J., or Father George Tavard on the same problem in American Roman Catholicism. If our recommendation of Dr. Beaver is accepted and he is willing to join our Commission, we expect to ask him to take principal responsibility for the shape and direction of the studies of Tradition and Traditions in the "younger churches."

As we look toward the future, we are aware that our progress has been slower than we had expected it to be and that even now there is no certainty as to where "the final stage" of our work will find us. We do expect to be prepared to present a basic report on "Theses and Findings" to the FOC Meeting in 1960. We are not aware that anything specific is expected of us in connection with the Third Assembly. Finally, we are planning to finish — or at least to terminate — our work by the summer of 1963.

In conclusion, it may not be out of order to mention that the Commission has held five annual meetings; that our work has had to be done on the marginal time of very busy people; that all but a tiny fraction of the travel and other expenses of the Commission have had to be borne by the members themselves, their universities and churches. At the same time, the project has proved enormously interesting and fruitful to most of us, and it has already had rather widespread — though largely indirect — results in arousing interest in our problem amongst the churches.

(5) Report of the Study Commission on Institutionalism

I. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENTS

At its meeting in Davos August 1955, the Faith and Order Working Committee decided to establish a Study Commission on Institutionalism, with the following terms of reference:

"To make a study of institutionalism as it affects all churches, and in particular:

1. The self-criticism of churches by which they may see their own structures sociologically as well as theologically;
2. The relations both positive and negative of the churches to each other in the ecumenical conversation;
3. The pattern of church relations which is finding expression in the World Council of Churches as an institution."

The exploratory consultations carried out during the following winter by the officers, Dean Walter G. Muelder and Professor Nils Ehrenström, were summed up in a statement on objectives and initial projects, which was approved by the Faith and Order Working Committee in July 1956¹.

The Commission has pursued its work by means of correspondence, exchange and criticism of papers, and two small meetings. Both meetings — July 3-6, 1957 and June 24-26, 1958 — were held at Boston University School of Theology. They were limited to North American Commission members and consultants, with a few non-American participants at the first meeting.

Because of the unexplored nature of the subject, both meetings spent considerable time in defining the objectives and scope of the Commission and in discussing basic issues of the role of institutional factors in the Church as they affect unity and disunity.

¹ The minutes of this meeting contain a report which traces the earlier discussions of the subject in Faith and Order, the terms of reference of the new Commission, and lists the proposed projects. The introductory paper by Dean Muelder on "Institutional Factors Affecting Unity and Disunity" was published in *The Ecumenical Review*, VIII.2, (January 1956).

In addition each had before it a number of draft papers and project outlines which received careful scrutiny. Each meeting summed up its deliberations in an agreed statement, including a definition of policy and a program of work¹. The document issued by the 1958 meeting is the basis of the current work of the Commission. It also lists the various projects now in process which fall in two categories: analysis of basic issues, and illustrative case studies. An up-to-date report is given in a memorandum "Survey of the Current Situation" of May 1958.

II. ISSUES UNDER DEBATE

The preliminary nature of the two meetings which have been held so far makes a detailed account of the discussions pointless. It will be more profitable to attempt a systematic summary, grouping the issues and viewpoints which have been raised around certain problem centers. The summary may be regarded as a background commentary on the "Program of Work," 1958. Considering the fluid and open-ended state of the studies on Institutionalism it is natural that such a report will largely deal with unanswered questions. It is too early to expect a consensus on substantive matters when there does not yet exist a fair agreement — even among so-called experts — on the definition of terms!

A. A Sociological and/or Theological Approach?

The Commission still finds itself in the stage of wrestling with *prolegomena*. Its task is complicated by the fact that it deals with a subject matter which is both a religious and a sociological reality, and which moreover can be studied from theological and/or sociological perspectives.

This basic fact allows for alternative conceptions of the task and approach of the Commission, which are still under debate. Broadly speaking, it is the accepted task of the Commission to undertake a descriptive and evaluative study of the role of institutional factors in the life of the churches as it affects unity and disunity. In other words, its two *membra comparationis* are "Church" and "Institution." Considerable confusion has been caused by the fact that, in much conventional thinking on these matters, the first is viewed as a religious phenomenon to be studied theologically, and the second as a social phenomenon to be studied sociologically. Some of the criticisms which have been leveled against the Commission's program seem to reflect such a false dichotomy of approach.

The Commission has taken the position that both "Church" and "Institution" can and must be studied from the perspective of both the theologian and that of the sociologist. For its part, it declared at the 1958 meeting that it "accepts its major task to be that of viewing the Church from a sociological perspective." Some commentators, overlooking the words "major task," have upbraided the Commission for having committed itself to a pragmatic sociological approach, thus betraying its disreputable American bias. It ignores — it is contended — that the problem primarily is that of the *theology* of institution and of the role of institution in the context of the Church, and not that of the *sociology* of the Church as a religious institution.

This reproach is based on a misunderstanding, however. The Commission has no intention to play down the significance of a theological approach, on the contrary. It stands for an interdisciplinary approach. It applies, one might say, the Calcedonian formula to the issue: the two approaches are inseparable yet not to be confused. The Commission has persistently emphasized the need for a theological "criteriology" as

¹ A general presentation of the issues with which the Commission is grappling is to be found in Dean Muelder's report presented to the North American Faith and Order Study Conference at Oberlin, Ohio, in Sept. 1957. It is published in the Conference Report, *The Nature of the Unity We Seek*, ed. Paul Minear (St. Louis, Bethany Press, 1958).

a basis for its evaluative work. It has sought the collaboration of biblical and theological scholars and has also invited the aid of other Faith and Order Study Commissions in clarifying the ecclesiological foundations of its work — with little success thus far.

The meetings have thrown up a host of questions which will call for further elucidation (or need to be discarded as irrelevant or wrongly posited). Are theological and sociological analysis coterminous and interacting pursuits which, both, legitimately extend over the whole range of the reality called the Church? Or is the Church, or some part or dimension of the Church, a divine mystery inaccessible to sociological categories? If it is true that the Church essentially is a reality *sui generis*, is then the kind of sociological investigation used in the study of social institutions precluded? Does the sociologist inevitably misinterpret or distort the nature of the Church by the very “tools” he uses?

Further, do the theologian and the sociologist share the same preconception of the object “church” which they plan to study? Or is it so that they, while intending to study a common object, as a matter of fact, because of their differing modes of thinking, do visualize different objects? If so, are their conclusions incommensurate? To what extent can they be brought on a common denominator?

On the level of evaluation, should such an inquiry (which is a Christian inquiry) throughout ascribe priority to theological and ecclesiological criteria? If so, where is the “normative pattern” of the Church, furnishing such criteria? Or are there certain ranges of institutional phenomena in the Church which are theologically value-indifferent, or where sociological criteria are primary?

B. Definitions

In outlining the scope of its assignment, the Commission has been blocked by the absence of agreed definitions. This relates to “church” as well as to “institution.”

1. Church

The diversity of meanings attached to the word “church” is notorious; and while Faith and Order over the years has brought about some measure of order in their classification, the bodies co-operating in Faith and Order have not yet been able to reach a common mind as to what constitutes the essential nature and marks of the Church. These theological divergencies in the self-interpretation of the Church are, again, compounded by the divergence between theological and sociological approaches, perceiving different objects or at least different aspects of the common object. The problem is further complicated by the not entirely unfounded suspicion that these ecclesiological differences are, at least in part, not theological at all but rationalizations of social and cultural developments.

To break this vicious circle and obtain a starting-point for the Commission’s work, several procedures have been suggested:

(a) Following the lead of the Faith and Order Commission on “Christ and the Church,” let us go back behind the diversifications of denominational history to the unadulterated and unified testimony of primitive Christianity about Christ and his Body, the Church, and examine the institutional elements of this normative pattern.

Critical questions have not been lacking. Does this testimony (provided it really is unified, which is debatable) constitute a commonly accepted norm? Can the apostolic church alone — with its still fluid and inchoate developments — be accepted as furnishing the normative image for all subsequent history? Does the intimate personal relationship between Jesus and his disciples involve institutional features? Was it pre-institutional? Does the normative age include also the second century? Or the so-called undivided Church of the first five centuries? Is perhaps this whole quest for an agreement about a pristine and immutable structure a utopian dream?

(b) Let us make a comparative study of dominant views about the Church and accept their common denominator as a platform on which to work — whether this may be acceptable to the theological purists or not.

It was pointed out that precisely this procedure had led Faith and Order to an impasse. In any case it would be a ground too loose to build on.

(c) Let us analyze how a number of individual denominations conceive the role of institution in their own context, and then proceed from a synthesis of their conceptions of institution in the Church.

This, too, found ready opponents.

(d) Let us altogether abandon this futile theological search for an acceptable definition of the Church — contended some sociologists — and rather start with the Church as an “objective” religious group, as empirical sociology sees it.

The proposal was discarded on several grounds. Sociologists were not known to be more united than the theologians. The unspoken assumptions underlying their definitions of the Church were subject to severe criticism. And above all, to start from such a premise would preclude any possibility of a theological evaluation of “good” and “bad” institutional features in the churches.

The discussions have not yet precipitated a common mind in the matter. The Commission is looking, more or less hopefully, to its sister Commission on “Christ and the Church” for some guidance. Meanwhile it has adopted the course of employing operational definitions. The “Program of Work,” 1958, defines the object, rather loosely, as “the flexible and socially relative patterns of *the historical churches*.”

2. Institution

To define “institution” and “institutionalism” has proved a no less baffling task. Earlier attempts in Faith and Order to initiate research on the influence of non-theological factors did not get off the ground largely because of the indefiniteness of the subject. The decision to concentrate on institutional factors was prompted by the expectation that such a specific thrust in a limited area would prove more successful. Yet, on closer analysis, it soon became apparent that this limitation to institutional factors carried with it its own difficulties. The discussions in and around the Commission have sometimes tended to use the term “institutionalism” in such a broad sense as to make it virtually co-extensive with “non-theological.” “Institution” is so intimately intertwined with other manifestations of the life of the Church that it has proved well-nigh impossible to isolate it for analysis. The case studies sponsored by the Commission reveal an inclination of the writers to include correlative factors — economic, political, racial, power structures, church order, polity, et cetera.

One of the reasons for these fluctuations is obviously the lack of commonly accepted definitions in sociology itself. A glossary, produced for the first meeting in 1957, listed some fifty definitions of “institution” in contemporary American sociological literature alone.

Resisting the temptation to add a definition of its own, the Commission has, for the time being, contented itself with some descriptive limitations of the subject matter. The “Program of Work,” 1958, refers to the fact that “definitions of ‘institution’ range widely from any persistent pattern of activity surrounding a human need on the one hand, to a precisely defined list of traits or characteristics such as purpose, charter, personnel, relative stability and norms on the other hand.” It further gives illustrative examples of institutional behavior.

A number of new questions arise when the two terms are brought in relation to one another. What is meant when we call the Church an institution? Or is it more correct to say that the Church *has* institutional features? Is the Church, also as institution, an entity *sui generis* which cannot be subsumed under a general sociological definition of institution? What is the common denominator of theological and sociological usages of the terms, which makes it possible to undertake a sociological analysis and evaluation of the Christian Church as a social institution?

“Institutionalism” and “institutionalization” are other high-frequency words in the lexicon of the Commission. The latter is a tongue-twister, but otherwise it presents

no serious difficulties as it, in its technical usage, is value-neutral. The former, on the other hand, is sometimes interpreted in a pejorative sense, suggesting a perversion of the true function of institution. This is all the more unfortunate since it forms the very title of the Commission. To obviate this misunderstanding, it has been expressly stated that the Commission intends "to use the term 'institutionalism' in an ambivalent sense, including both good and bad features of institutional life."

C. The Task of the Commission

The terms of reference have already been quoted above. As regards the proper interpretation of this brief, the Commission has agreed on certain points including the following :

1. *Focus on Unity.* In designing its projects, and in responding to suggestions from various quarters, the Commission is constantly emphasizing that it is not concerned with a generalized study of institutional factors in the Church. It is undertaking an inquiry in the specific field of Faith and Order. Nevertheless, the novelty of the subject makes it necessary to consider a vast amount of potentially relevant data precisely in order to discover which among them carry ecumenical significance. Thus the focus is unity ; but the initial basis of research must be broader.

2. *Focus on Organizational Aspects.* Within the unbounded range of institutional phenomena, however defined, the Commission has felt the need for a further limitation of its objective. It was therefore agreed at the 1957 meeting to pay chief attention, at least for some time, to organizational aspects of institutionalism as distinct, e.g., from creedal and liturgical aspects.

3. *Need for Cross-Fertilisation.* The Commission on Institutionalism is a part of a (supposedly) integrated Faith and Order program which in turn serves the World Council of Churches as a whole. Hence it cannot and must not pursue its inquiries in isolation. Nor can the Commission be compartmentalized as the "sociological wing" of the WCC. Close cooperation and exchange with the other Faith and Order study commissions are imperative. Institutionalism is more than a distinct field of investigation ; it is a dimension of the problems with which the other commissions, and the WCC and its member churches as a whole, are grappling. The inquiries of the Commission raise a host of challenging questions which should receive proper attention in the other sectors of the WCC program as well. Conversely, the Commission is greatly dependent upon the parallel Faith and Order studies on the Church in particular.

D. Substantive Issues

The meetings in 1957 and in 1958 roamed far afield. As they discussed basic issues, reviewed draft papers, and designed new projects, they touched upon a multitude of questions — some at considerable length, others docketed for consideration in later stages. Some of them have been analyzed in individual papers issued by the Commission.

Among the recurring themes were the following :

1. *The Church as Koinonia and as Institution*

This is the basal problem facing the Commission. Without a clear grasp of this interrelationship, it cannot construct any valid criteria for analyzing and evaluating institutional factors. Unfortunately, as the Commission has realized, it is also one of the most confused and controversial issues in contemporary Protestant thought. The circumstance, moreover, which has already been referred to, that the theological and sociological definitions of the two terms are variables, multiplies the range of variability of possible answers. Little wonder therefore that the Commission has not yet been able to attain any substantial clarification of the matter. It is exploring some promising avenues — no more.

In the first place, the Commission is seeking to develop the truth that koinonia and institution are distinct yet inseparable. It seeks to find a passageway between the scylla

of a spiritualizing ultra-Protestantism, which interprets the church in exclusive personalistic terms, denouncing institutionalization as a "fall," and on the other hand the charybdis of an ultra-Catholic legalism, which makes koinonia and institution indistinguishable.

Within this general formulation of the problem, the discussion has shown a wide variety of viewpoints and emphases. An Anglican participant at the first meeting voiced the suspicion that the group had a subconscious anti-institutional bias. But if there were any evidence of such a bias in the discussion, it was clearly transcended in the agreed statements issued by both meetings. The 1958 meeting states, speaking of the positive values of institutions: "The Commission agrees that every Christian group has persistent patterns of common life, and in at least this minimum sense is an institution. Institutional forms often have positive and constructive value for a particular church and for the whole of God's people. The common life is dependent upon their proper function."

At both meetings the Commission had before it papers on the subject by its German and Swedish members which provoked a vigorous discussion. Continental Protestantism, and especially its Lutheran wing, has long been deeply influenced by Rudolph Sohm and his spiritualization of the church. A counter-movement is now on foot, seeking to rehabilitate institution and law as organic elements of the structure of the church. The papers just mentioned reflect this position — especially the German one with its insistence that institution is not merely a human social phenomenon, as a secularized sociology contends, but an ontological datum; the institutional order of the church is a God-given reality which is the ground and the norm of the varied historical forms in which it is embodied.

The thesis met with both approval and rebuttal. Is it compatible with Christian personalism to regard institutions as part of the essential structure of the Church? Does not the history of New Testament Christianity reveal an initial period of charismatic functions, which only later were stereotyped into institutional offices? Was the community around Jesus less "church" because it lacked some of the structurings which emerged in later ages as responses to new needs? And what is gained, for the purposes of our Commission, by trying to develop a Christian ontology of social institutions? Does not such an approach make a dialogue between theology and sociology impossible?

This debate led inevitably to a further issue. How can we discuss institutional factors normatively? Granting (which not all were prepared to do) that institution is an integral part of the divine-human nature of the church — what then are the principles of discrimination (a) between divine and human elements, (b) between necessary constants and historical variants, and (c) between "good" and "bad" institutional features? At the second meeting in 1958 the discussion of this point was brought a step forward by relating institution to the classical distinction between the order and the organization of the church¹. The church, it was said, is both koinonia and institution in the sense that it is "an ordered structure which at all times and in all places serves as the means by which God constitutes the Church as a Church." This order is the norm by which to judge the varied organizational and administrative forms of the churches in history.

How then can we distinguish between this constant, God-given order and its diversified historical embodiments? And what constitutes that order? Two contrasting answers were suggested: (a) Going back to the origins of the Christian church, we can discern this order in a stage of relative purity, unaffected by historical accretions and distortions; (b) The double principle of discrimination is to be found in church order as a complex of essential functions and in the apostolicity of the church.

¹ The Commission benefited here from the illuminating discussion of the problem at the North American Faith and Order Conference on "The Nature of the Unity We Seek" at Oberlin, Ohio, September 1957, and in a preliminary paper produced by a study group in Toronto.

2. *Inconsistencies and Incompatibilities in the Institutional Life of the Churches*

The discussions and documents of the Commission have supplied a wealth of data for a sociological analysis of the institutional life of the churches — on bureaucracy, routinization, the divorce between grass roots and administrative top, power struggles, discrepancies between denominational self-image and institutional operations, the interaction of institutionalizing agents, environmental influences, the self-perpetuating tendency of hallowed institutions, and so forth.

Many of these observations illustrate a general feature which suggests a fruitful line of further investigation — the inconsistencies and incompatibilities in the institutional life of the churches. These are of many different kinds. Within each denomination there are constant and flagrant discrepancies between institutional patterns and the purpose or “order” they are intended to serve. An Episcopal church may be Congregationalist in policy. The inertial guidance-systems of established institutions reject or absorb the institutionalizing dynamics of new religious insights and pioneering ventures.

Interdenominational tensions and estrangements are caused not only by incompatibilities of temper and doctrine but also, to a far greater extent than has been commonly recognized, by incompatibilities of institutional structure and behaviour. The case studies undertaken by the Commission furnish many striking, and sometimes tragicomic, illustrations of this fact. . . It would seem that — in regard to most Protestant communions today — such institutional incompatibilities, and not doctrinal differences, form the chief obstacle to a rapprochement. Negotiations have failed for the simple reason that delegates were not sufficiently aware of the institutional behavior patterns of the other denomination to know what was “protocol” in a given situation. Clashes between ecclesiastical rank systems in organizing processions have more than once provoked denominational aggressiveness in ecumenical conferences.

The attention of the Commission has also been drawn to other, seemingly innocuous discrepancies which nonetheless obstruct interdenominational cooperation at local, national and global levels — such as the decisive influence of differences in church calendar, long range programming, and overlapping denominational jurisdiction.

3. *Ecumenical Institutionalization*

These exploratory excursions in various directions over the past few years have confronted the Commission with a final, immensely challenging problem — that of ecumenical institutionalization. What is meant is this. The existing institutional structures of the churches, of all churches, are now obsolescent inasmuch as they reflect the conditions of a pre-ecumenical age. Whether coherent or fragmented, whether good or bad, those historical structures now impede the advancing ecumenical reformation of Christendom. Transversal movements of renewal are overleaping denominational boundaries, new ecumenical vitalities are bursting forth, which demand appropriate institutional expression. This demand is not met by simply grafting ecumenical institutions onto pre-ecumenical structures as is the case today in local, national, and world councils. It requires processes of institutionalization which progressively embody the one universal koinonia.

NOTE:

The “Program of Work”, 1958 referred to in this Report was printed as Appendix I to the 1958 Minutes of the Faith and Order Working Committee (FOC Paper n° 26), pp. 44-46.

BAPTISM

(Under the auspices of the Faith and Order Commission a group of European theologians of the Reformed and Lutheran traditions — ten from each — have discussed for some years points which in the past have been controversial among these churches of the Reformation. In previous years “The authority of the Holy Scriptures for the proclamation of the Church” and “The presence of Christ in the Church” were the subjects of discussion. In this year’s meeting the problem of baptism was studied. In making available the results of their agreement the members of the consultation wish to point out that they are well aware that the following “Theses” do not adequately deal with *all* aspects of baptism and that, for instance, the problem of infant baptism will need further discussion.)

I. Who acts in baptism ?

1. In baptism it is the Triune God who acts. This action has its foundation in the once-for-all redemptive work of Jesus Christ, which is perfected in his death and resurrection, and to which he had been called in the baptism in Jordan as the suffering servant and king of the new people of the covenant.
2. The community of Jesus Christ baptizes in obedience to the word of institution of its risen Lord. It does this not only in the confidence that God will recognize and bless its obedient action, but in the certainty that Jesus Christ, and thus the Triune God, himself does his own work here in the service of men.
3. In that in baptism reception into the people of the new covenant takes place, baptism shows itself, in replacing the Old Testament circumcision of the flesh, to be the true sealing, in the heart effected by the Spirit, of membership of the covenant.

II. What happens to us in baptism ?

1. By baptism we are ingrafted into Christ. This is a once-for-all happening. Just as Jesus Christ died for us once for all on the cross at Golgotha and rose again on the third day, so baptism is the once-for-all act which testifies to and indelibly seals the taking of the individual man into the death and resurrection of the Lord.
2. Since we are buried with Jesus Christ into his death, our life in sin has found its judgment and its end. The righteousness which our Saviour won on the cross is reckoned to us from there, and so our sins are forgiven. We are now freed from the dominion of all foreign powers, and free to walk in the new life. Jesus Christ has opened the door for us to this new life, and he gives us new being through the power of his resurrection.
3. As members of the Body of Christ we are by baptism put into the visible community of those who hear his voice and confess him. As citizens of the kingdom we are now on the way, and await the final disclosure of the glory of Christ.

III. How does this happen in baptism ?

1. By the preaching of the word and the bathing of the baptized person in water which accompanies it, God declares him and makes him a child of God. For we are certain in faith, that what God promises he does, in the strength of the Holy Spirit promised by him and besought by us.

2. In the divine service of the community, through preaching, baptism and the Lord's supper, we are offered one and the same salvation in Christ. The special feature of baptism is that here, through the word clothed in an action, once for all and in an unrepeatable and irrevocable manner, new life is given and sealed to the individual.
3. It is Christ himself who acts in baptism. Hence baptism cannot be understood as a happening separated from the action of Christ, and guaranteed by the mere performance of the rite or by the strength of human believing. God stands by his word. Hence baptism cannot be understood merely as a symbolical act separated from the promise of God and merely representing the redemptive action.

IV. How do we use baptism aright ?

1. Baptism, in which we receive God's promise, embraces the whole of life. It summons the baptized person ever anew to believe that God in his faithfulness does not take back his calling. It calls for a faith which endures to the end. It permits the baptized person no security in the flesh concerning his salvation, but neither does it let him fall a prey to despair. It sets the community of believers, as the firstfruits of the new world, at the place indicated by God's saving will for the whole of mankind.
2. As baptized persons we are called to follow Christ, i.e. to be obedient to Christ who has gone before in obedience. This obedience brings the fruit of repentance in the struggle of the spirit against the flesh, in which we overcome selfishness, love the brethren, and serve one another with the gifts which we have received. This membership of the Body of Christ imposes upon us the duty of summoning both the world and ourselves from the service of sin to discipleship of Christ.
3. Baptism is given to us as a pledge of future glory. It requires us as members of the pilgrim people of God to look hopefully towards the end in which the old world is abolished and a world has appeared in which righteousness dwells. This hope of the end, confirmed to us in baptism, gives us the strength to bear and outlast the sufferings of this time, and impels us to witness in our whole life to the renewed world.

LETTER

from the Archbishop of Canterbury to Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft

Lambeth Palace,
London, S. E. 1
14th August 1958

My dear Visser 't Hooft,

As you know the Report of the Lambeth Conference will not be published until August 26, and nothing from it may be communicated to the Press before that date. But with that proviso, I think I should let you have now the two Resolutions on Nomenclature adopted by the Conference (with the passage from the Committee report referred to), so that if you wished to, you could let members of the Central Committee who would be interested know what we have done.

At the same time please regard this letter as discharging the duty laid upon me by the second of the two Resolutions "to communicate this (the first) resolution to the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches for its information." The two resolutions are as follows and the relevant extract from the Committee Report is appended.

Full Communion and Intercommunion

14. The Conference endorses the paragraph in the Report of the Committee on Church Unity which refers to the use of the terms "full communion" and "intercommunion," and recommends accordingly that where between two Churches not of the same denominational or confessional family, there is unrestricted *communio in sacris*, including mutual recognition and acceptance of ministries, the appropriate term to use is "full communion," and that where varying degrees of relation other than "full communion" are established by agreement between two such Churches the appropriate term is "intercommunion."
15. The Conference therefore requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to communicate this resolution to the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches for its information.

Extract from Committee Report

The Committee has examined the use of the terms "full communion" and "intercommunion" in official documents in recent years. Although since 1931 the terminology used to describe various degrees of inter-Church relationship has been inconsistent and confusing, the most common usage has been that advocated by the Lund Faith and Order Conference in 1952, whereby the term "full communion" has been kept to describe the close relation which exists between Churches of the same denominational or confessional family, such as the Churches of the Anglican Communion, and of the Orthodox, Lutheran, or Reformed "families" of Churches; whereas the term "intercommunion" has been used to describe varying degrees of relation between Churches of one communion with a Church or Churches of another. Thus, for example, various Provinces and Churches of the Anglican Communion enjoy unrestricted *communio in sacris*

with the Old Catholic Churches. Such unrestricted *communio in sacris*, involving complete sacramental fellowship and the mutual recognition and acceptance of ministries, has been described as "full intercommunion." It has however been pointed out that, although there may be a logical satisfaction in distinguishing between the "full communion" which exists between Churches which have grown up within the same family, and the "full intercommunion" which has been established with Churches outside the family, there is no distinction so far as spiritual reality is concerned. In each case there is unrestricted *communio in sacris*.

The Committee therefore has concluded that it would be less confusing and indeed more true to reality to use the term "full communion" in all cases where a Province of the Anglican Communion by agreement enters into a relation of unrestricted *communio in sacris*, including the mutual recognition of ministries, with a Church outside our Communion. This would mean, for example, that the relation already existing between Churches of our Communion with the Old Catholic Churches would henceforth be described as that of "full communion" rather than "full intercommunion." The term "intercommunion" could then be used to describe the varying degrees of relation other than full communion, which already exist, or may be established in the future, between Churches of the Anglican family with others outside this family.

Yours sincerely,

(signed) GEOFFREY CANTUAR :

MEMBERS OF THE FAITH AND ORDER COMMISSION
AND THE SECRETARIAT OF THE COMMISSION

(* signifies member of the Working Committee)

Chairman : Dean DOUGLAS HORTON (United Church of Christ, U.S.A.),
Randolph, New Hampshire, U.S.A.

Vice-Chairman : * Rev. Professor H. D'ESPINE (Swiss Protestant Church
Federation), 2 avenue de Combes, Geneva, Switzerland.

Secretary : Rev. Dr. KEITH R. BRIDSTON (Evangelical Lutheran Church,
U.S.A.), 17 route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland.

Members

Professor H. S. ALIVISATOS (Church of Greece), 29 Argentinis Dimo-
kratias, Athens, Greece.

Bishop H. B. AMSTUTZ (Methodist Church in S.E. Asia), Methodist Head-
quarters, P.O. Box 483, Singapore 6, Malaya.

Most Rev. Archbishop ATHENAGORAS, Metropolitan of Thyateira (Ecu-
menical Patriarchate of Constantinople, Exarchate in Western Europe),
8 Dawson Place, London W.2, England.

Rev. Dr. FARID AUDEH (Evangelical Synod of Syria and Lebanon), c/o
American Mission, P.O. Box 235, Beirut, Lebanon.

Bishop S. U. BARBIERI (Methodist Church in Argentina), Casilla 5296,
Correo Central, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Most Rev. W. F. BARFOOT (Anglican Church in Canada), Synod Office,
Trinity Hall, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

* PERCY W. BARTLETT (Society of Friends in Great Britain), 120 Southsea
Avenue, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex, England.

President CONRAD BERGENDOFF (Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church,
U.S.A.), 835 35th Street, Rock Island, Illinois, U.S.A.

Dr. H. BERKHOF (Dutch Reformed Church), Driebergen, Horstlaan 3,
Netherlands.

Rev. Professor J. H. BODENSIECK (American Lutheran Church), Wartburg
Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa, U.S.A.

Rev. C. B. BRINK (Dutch Reformed Church of S. Africa in Transvaal),
21 Rhodes Avenue, Parktown, Johannesburg, South Africa.

Rev. Professor DAVID CAIRNS (Church of Scotland), 2 Carden Terrace,
Aberdeen, Scotland.

Rev. Professor ROBERT L. CALHOUN (United Church of Christ, U.S.A.),
409 Prospect Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A.

Rev. Principal L. G. CHAMPION (Baptist Union of Great Britain and
Ireland), The Baptist College, Woodland Road, Bristol 8, England.

* Rev. Principal J. R. CHANDRAN (Church of South India), United
Theological College, 17 Miller's Road, Bangalore 1, South India.

- Rev. Principal H. F. LOVELL COCKS (Congregational Union of England and Wales), Western College, 1 Cotham Road, Bristol 6, England.
- Professor G. R. CRAGG (United Church of Canada), Andover-Newton Theological School, Newton Center 59, Mass., U.S.A.
- Rev. MARCOS DAOU (Coptic Orthodox Church), Faggala P.O. Box 44, Cairo, Egypt.
- Rev. Professor V. E. DEVADUTT (Council of Baptist Churches in North India), Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester 20, N.Y., U.S.A.
- Rev. Professor EDWARD A. DOWEY (United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.), Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.
- * Rt. Rev. ANGUS DUN, Bishop of Washington (Protestant Episcopal Church, U.S.A.), 1702 Rhode Island Avenue N.W., Washington 6, D.C., U.S.A.
- Rev. S. DURAIKAN (Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches of India), Lutheran Church, 14 West Marret Street, Madura, South India.
- Rev. Director PEHR EDWALL (Church of Sweden), Samariterhemmet, Uppsala, Sweden.
- Dean S. J. ENGLAND (Disciples of Christ, U.S.A.), 2202 East Maple Avenue, Enid, Oklahoma, U.S.A.
- Rev. Dr. R. NEWTON FLEW (Methodist Church of Great Britain), 49 Glisson Road, Cambridge, England.
- * Rev. Professor GEORGES FLOROVSKY (Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, Ecumenical Patriarchate), Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge 38, Mass., U.S.A.
- Professor Dr. HAAKON FLOTTORP (Church of Norway), Kristiansand off. Laererskole, Kristiansand, Norway.
- Rev. NORMAN GILKISON (Presbyterian Church of New Zealand), 33 Young Street, St. Kilda, Dunedin, S. 2, New Zealand.
- Professor D. GLUMAÇ (Orthodox Patriarchate of Serbia), Cara Lazara 16, Belgrade, Yugoslavia.
- Rev. JAMES GRAY (Churches of Christ in Great Britain and Ireland), 49 Holmfield Road, Leicester, England.
- * President PERRY E. GRESHAM (Disciples of Christ, U.S.A.), Pendleton Heights, Bethany College, Bethany, W.Va., U.S.A.
- Bishop E. C. GULIN (Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland), Tampere, Finland.
- Rev. W. F. HAMBLY (Methodist Church of Australia), Lincoln College, 45 Brougham Place, North Adelaide, South Australia.
- Rev. Professor ROBERT T. HANDY (American Baptist Convention), Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th Street, New York 27, U.S.A.
- * Rev. Professor R. R. HARTFORD (Church of Ireland), 39 Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.
- Rev. Professor DAVID W. HAY (Presbyterian Church in Canada), Knox College, Toronto, Canada.
- U BA HMYIN (Burma Baptist Convention), American Baptist Mission, 143 St. John's Road, Rangoon, Burma.

- Bishop IVAN LEE HOLT (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), 20 North Kingshighway, St. Louis 9, Missouri, U.S.A.
- Rt. Rev. A. W. HOWELLS, Bishop of Lagos (Church of the Province of West Africa), Bishops court, Lagos, Nigeria.
- Professor Dr. J. HROMADKA (Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren), Moravska 47, Prague, Czechoslovakia.
- Professor BASIL IOANNIDIS (Church of Greece), Theological Faculty, University, Athens, Greece.
- * General superintendent Dr. G. JACOB (Evangelical Church in Germany), Berlin-Charlottenburg 2, Jebensstrasse 3, Germany.
- * Metropolitan JUHANON MAR THOMA (Mar Thoma Syrian Church of Malabar), Tiruvalla P.O., Travancore, South India.
- * Rev. Professor T. A. KANTONEN (United Lutheran Church in America), 954 Pythian Avenue, Springfield, Ohio, U.S.A.
- Professor Dr. E. KINDER (Evangelical Church in Germany), Martin Lutherstr. 5, Münster in Westf., Germany.
- Rev. Professor D. BROUGHTON KNOX (Church of England in Australia), Moore College, Newtown, N.S.W., Australia.
- * Professor Dr. CHRYS. KONSTANTINIDIS (Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople), Üsküdar, Allâme Caddesi 82, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Ds. P.D. LATUIHAMALLO (Protestant Church of the Moluccas), Sekolah Tinggi Theologia, Pegangsaan Timur 27, Djakarta III/20, Indonesia.
- Bishop HANNS LILJE (Evangelical Church in Germany) Calenbergerstr. 34, Hannover, Germany.
- President JOHN A. MACKAY (United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.), 86 Mercer Street, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.
- * Rev. Principal JOHN MARSH (Congregational Union of England and Wales), Mansfield College, Oxford, England.
- Rt. Rev. LAKDASA DE MEL, Bishop of Kurunagala (Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon), Bishop's House, Kurunagala, Ceylon.
- Rev. Professor PAUL S. MINEAR (United Church of Christ, U.S.A.), 247 St. Ronan Street, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.
- Professor Dr. E. MOLLAND (Church of Norway), Jacob Aals gt. 45 b, Oslo, Norway.
- Dr. C. P. MOREHOUSE (Protestant Episcopal Church, U.S.A.), 14 East 41st Street, New York 17, N.Y., U.S.A.
- Dean WALTER G. MUELDER (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), 745 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
- President SHIRO MURATA (Church of Christ in Japan), 96 Sheba-Shirokane, Imazatocho, Minato-Ku, Tokyo, Japan.
- * Dean J. ROBERT NELSON (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), The Divinity School, Vanderbilt University, Nashville 5, Tenn., U.S.A.
- Professor Dr. W. NIESEL (Evangelical Church in Germany), Schoeller, Post Dornap, Germany.
- Rev. Dr. D. T. NILES (Methodist Church in Ceylon), Vembadi, Jaffna, Ceylon.
- Principal J. NØRGAARD (Baptist Union of Denmark), Tølløse, Denmark.

- Bishop ANDERS NYGREN (Church of Sweden), Helgonavägen 10, Lund, Sweden.
- * Rev. Professor A. C. OUTLER (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas 5, Texas, U.S.A.
- Metropolitan PARTHENIOS (Patriarchate of Alexandria), Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, P.O. Box 2006, Alexandria, Egypt.
- * Rev. Dr. E. A. PAYNE (Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland), Baptist Church House, 4 Southampton Row, London, W.C.1, England.
- Rev. Father K. PHILIPOS (Orthodox Syrian Church of Malabar), Cheria Pally, Kottayam, Travancore, South India.
- Most Rev. A. M. RAMSEY, Archbishop of York (Church of England), Bishopthorpe, York, England.
- Rt. Rev. A. E. J. RAWLINSON (Church of England), 105 Corringham Road, London, N. W. 11, England.
- Dr. H. G. RENKEWITZ (Moravian Church, Germany), Evangelische Akademie, Arnoldshain bei Schmitten/Taunus, Germany.
- Rt. Rev. KENNETH RICHES, Bishop of Lincoln (Church of England), Bishop's House, Eastgate, Lincoln, England.
- Most Rev. Archbishop A. RINKEL (Old Catholic Church), Emmalaan 8, Utrecht, Netherlands.
- * Rev. Principal HAROLD ROBERTS (Methodist Church of Great Britain), 2 College House, Richmond College, Richmond, Surrey, England.
- Professor PRESTON T. ROBERTS, Jr. (General Conference of the Society of Friends), 5619 S. Dorchester Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois, U.S.A.
- Rev. Professor E. GORDON RUPP (Methodist Church of Great Britain), 11 the Meade, Chorltonville, Manchester 21, England.
- * Professor Dr. E. W. L. SCHLINK (Evangelical Church in Germany), Heidelberg, Plankengasse 1, Germany.
- Rev. Professor A. SCHMEMANN (Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America), 537 West 121st Street, New York 27, N.Y., U.S.A.
- His Holiness MAR SHIMUM (Holy Apostolic Catholic Church of the East (Assyrians)), 750 Gonzales Drive, San Francisco 27, Calif., U.S.A.
- Bishop FERDINAND SIGG (Methodist Church, Central and Southern Europe), Badenerstrasse 69, Zürich, Switzerland.
- Rev. Professor J. A. SITTLER (United Lutheran Church, U.S.A.), 4833 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago 15, Illinois, U.S.A.
- * Professor JOHN E. SKOGLUND (American Baptist Convention), Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester 20, N. Y., U.S.A.
- * Professor Dr. K. E. SKYDSGAARD (Evangelical Lutheran Church of Denmark), St. Kannikestraede 11, 2, Copenhagen K., Denmark.
- * Rev. Professor T. M. TAYLOR (United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.), Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary, 616 North Highland Avenue, Pittsburgh 6, Penna., U.S.A.
- Rev. Professor J. N. THOMAS (Presbyterian Church, U.S.), 3401 Brook Road, Richmond, Virginia, U.S.A.
- His Holiness TIRAN NERSOYAN (Armenian Apostolic Church), Armenian Patriarchate, Kum Kapu, Istanbul, Turkey.

- * The Rt. Rev. O. S. TOMKINS, Bishop of Bristol (Church of England), Bishop's House, Clifton Hill, Bristol 8, England. *Chairman of the Working Committee.*
- * Rev. Professor T. F. TORRANCE (Church of Scotland), 21 South Oswald Road, Edinburgh 9, Scotland.
- Dr. L. VETÖ (Lutheran Church of Hungary), Ulloi-utca 24, Budapest, Hungary.
- Pasteur CHARLES WESTPHAL (Reformed Church of France), 62 rue de Rome, Paris 8^e, France.
- * Professor Dr. G. F. WINGREN (Church of Sweden), Vintergatan 2^c, Lund, Sweden.
- Rev. Dr. J. W. WINTERHAGER (Evangelical Church in Germany), Niedstr. 27, Berlin-Friedenau, Germany.
- Rt. Rev. M. H. YASHIRO (Anglican Church in Japan), 5 Nakayamate-dori, 3-chome, Ikutaku, Kobe, Japan.
- Professor L. ZANDER (Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople: Exarchate for Russians in the West), 4 rue Alsace-Lorraine, Boulogne-sur-Seine, France.

MEMBERSHIP OF THEOLOGICAL COMMISSIONS

THEOLOGICAL COMMISSION ON CHRIST AND THE CHURCH

American Section

- Prof. R. L. CALHOUN (United Church of Christ), 409 Prospect Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A. *Chairman*
- Prof. W. N. PITTENGER (Protestant Episcopal Church), General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York 11, N.Y., U.S.A. *Vice-Chairman*.
- Professor G. R. CRAGG (United Church of Canada), Andover-Newton Theological School, Newton Center 59, Mass., U.S.A. *Secretary*.
- Prof. CLAUDE WELCH (Methodist Church), 409 Prospect Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A. *Associate Secretary*.
- Prof. T. ARIGA (Church of Christ in Japan), Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan. Corresponding member.
- Professor N. S. F. FERRÉ (Methodist Church), Andover-Newton Theological School, Newton Center 59, Mass., U.S.A.
- Prof. F. V. FILSON (United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.), McCormick Theological Seminary, 2330 North Halstead Street, Chicago 14, Ill., U.S.A.
- Prof. GEORGES FLOROVSKY (Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, Ecumenical Patriarchate), Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge 38, Mass., U.S.A.
- Rev. Professor E. R. HARDY (Protestant Episcopal Church), Berkeley Divinity School, 140 Prospect Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A.
- Dean WALTER HARRELSON (American Baptist Convention), Divinity School, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill., U.S.A.
- Prof. T. A. KANTONEN (United Lutheran Church), 954 Pythian Avenue, Springfield, Ohio, U.S.A.
- Prof. JOHN KNOX (Protestant Episcopal Church), Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th Street, New York 27, N.Y., U.S.A.
- Prof. P. S. MINEAR (United Church of Christ), 247 St. Ronan Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A.
- Dean J. ROBERT NELSON (Methodist Church), The Divinity School, Vanderbilt University, Nashville 5, Tenn., U.S.A.
- Prof. H. RICHARD NIEBUHR (United Church of Christ), 409 Prospect Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A.

European Section

- Bishop ANDERS NYGREN (Church of Sweden), Helgonavägen 10, Lund, Sweden. *Chairman*.
- Professor G. W. H. LAMPE (Church of England), The University, Edmund Street, Birmingham 3, England. *Vice-Chairman*.
- Rev. Principal G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY (Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland), Spurgeon's College, South Norwood Hill, London S.E. 25, England. *Secretary*.
- Dr. MAURICE A. CREASEY (Society of Friends in Great Britain), Woodbrooke College, Selly Oak, Birmingham 29, England.

- Prof. Dr. OSCAR CULLMANN (Swiss Protestant Church Federation), Hebelstrasse 17, Basel, Switzerland. Corresponding member.
- Prof. CHRYS. KONSTANTINIDIS (Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople), Üsküdar, Allâme Caddesi 82, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Prof. Dr. WALTER KRECK (Evangelical Church in Germany), Gregor Mendelstr. 27, Bonn, Germany.
- Principal JOHN MARSH (Congregational Union of England and Wales), Mansfield College, Oxford, England.
- Rev. C. G. W. NICHOLLS (Episcopal Church in Scotland), 11 Chalmers Street, Edinburgh 3, Scotland.
- Prof. Dr. EDMUND SCHLINK (Evangelical Church in Germany), Plankengasse 1, Heidelberg, Germany.
- Prof. T. F. TORRANCE (Church of Scotland), 21 South Oswald Road, Edinburgh 9, Scotland.
- Prof. G. F. WINGREN (Church of Sweden), Vintergatan 2^c, Lund, Sweden.

THEOLOGICAL COMMISSIONS ON WORSHIP

A. North America

- Prof. J. A. SITTLER (United Lutheran Church), 4833 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago 15, Ill., U.S.A. *Chairman*.
- Professor L. J. TRINTERUD (United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.) 2330 North Halstead Street, Chicago 14, Ill., U.S.A. *Vice-Chairman*.
- Dr. PRESTON T. ROBERTS, Jr. (General Conference of the Society of Friends), 5619 S. Dorchester Avenue, Chicago 37, Ill., U.S.A. *Secretary*.
- Professor MARKUS BARTH (United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.), 4846 S. Kimbark Avenue, Chicago 15, Ill., U.S.A.
- President C. J. I. BERGENDOFF (Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church), 835 35th Street, Rock Island, Ill., U.S.A.
- Prof. R. E. CUSHMAN (Methodist Church), Duke Divinity School, Durham, N.C., U.S.A.
- Prof. FRED HERZOG (United Church of Christ), Mission House Seminary, Plymouth, Wisconsin, U.S.A.
- Prof. WINTHROP HUDSON (American Baptist Convention), Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester 20, N.Y., U.S.A.
- Prof. J. P. HYATT (Disciples of Christ), The Divinity School, Vanderbilt University, Nashville 5, Tenn., U.S.A.
- Prof. WILLIAM M. KELLY (United Church of Canada), Emmanuel College, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Prof. J. C. RYLAARSDAM (Reformed Church in America), Federated Theological Faculty, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill., U.S.A.
- Prof. ALEXANDER SCHMEMANN (Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America), 537 West 121st Street, New York 27, N.Y., U.S.A.

- Prof. M. H. SHEPHERD (Protestant Episcopal Church), Church Divinity School of the Pacific, 2451 Ridge Road, Berkeley, Calif., U.S.A.
- Professor D. D. WILLIAMS (United Church of Christ), 3041 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y., U.S.A.
- Professor F. W. YOUNG (Protestant Episcopal Church), 32 McCosh Hall, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., U.S.A.

B. Europe

- Rt. Rev. KENNETH RICHES, Bishop of Lincoln (Church of England), Bishop's House, Eastgate, Lincoln, England. *Chairman*
- Professor REGIN PRENTER (Evangelical Lutheran Church of Denmark), Hellerupvej 8, Aarhus, Denmark. *Vice-Chairman*.
- Rev. A. RAYMOND GEORGE (Methodist Church of Great Britain), Lathbury House, Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds 6, England. *Secretary*.
- Prof. Dr. J. J. VON ALLMEN (Swiss Protestant Church Federation), Evole 68, Neuchâtel, Switzerland.
- Rev. Professor BORIS BOBRINSKOY (Russian Exarchate in Western Europe of the Ecumenical Patriarchate), 93 rue de Crimée, Paris 19^e, France.
- Prof. JEAN BOSCH (Reformed Church of France), 53-55 avenue du Maine, Paris 14^e, France.
- The Ven. J. O. COBHAM (Church of England), The College, Durham, England.
- Prof. Dr. WILHELM HAHN (Evangelical Church in Germany), Kapellenweg 8, Heidelberg, Germany.
- Dr. A. F. N. LEKKERKERKER (Dutch Reformed Church), Verzetstrijderslaan 47, Groningen, Netherlands.
- Prof. Dr. H. RIESENFELD (Church of Sweden), Dekanhuset, The University, Uppsala, Sweden.
- Prof. Dr. ALBERT E. RÜTHY (Old Catholic Church of Switzerland), Muristrasse 6, Berne, Switzerland.
- Prof. D. HERMANN SCHLINGENSIEPEN (Evangelical Church in Germany), Missionstrasse 9, Wuppertal-Barmen, Germany.
- Dr. VILMOS VAJTA (Church of Sweden), Lutheran World Federation, 17 route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Prof. Dr. CLAUS WESTERMANN (Evangelical Church in Germany), Bergstrasse 115, Heidelberg, Germany.

C. East Asia

- Principal J. R. CHANDRAN (Church of South India), United Theological College, 17 Miller's Road, Bangalore 1, South India. *Chairman*.
- Rt. Rev. LAKDASA DE MEL, Bishop of Kurunagala (Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon), Kurunagala, Ceylon. *Vice-Chairman*.
- President C. KISHI (Lutheran Church in Japan), Lutheran Theological Seminary, Saginomiya, Suginami, Tokyo, Japan. *Vice-Chairman*.
- Dr. A. N. GOPAL (Andhra Evangelical Lutheran Church), Lutheran Theological College, Luthergeri, Rajahmundry, Andhra Pradesh, India. *Secretary*.

- Dr. FRANCISCO S. GALVEZ (Methodist Church in the Philippines), P.O. Box 756, Manila, Philippines.
- U BA HMYIN (Burma Baptist Convention), American Baptist Mission, 143 St. John's Road, Rangoon, Burma.
- Rev. Dr. SVERRE HOLTH (Anglican), 85 Cavanagh Road, Singapore 9, Malaya.
- Rt. Rev. WILLIAM Q. LASH, Bishop of Bombay (Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon), St. John's House, Duxbury Lane, Colaba, Bombay 5, India.
- Dr. P. D. LATUIHAMALLO (Protestant Church of the Moluccas), Sekolah Tinggi Theologia, Pegangsaan Timur 27, Djakarta III/20, Indonesia.
- Rev. KEN MUTO (Nippon Kirisuto Kyodan, Japan), Chu-O Church, Haruki-cho, Hongo, Tokyo, Japan.
- Rev. Fr. KORAH PHILIPOS (Orthodox Syrian Church of Malabar), Cheria Pally, Kottayam, Travancore, South India.
- Rev. Dr. A. THAKUR DAS (United Church of Northern India and Pakistan), Commission on Ecumenical Mission & Relations of the United Presbyterian Church U.S.A., 475 Riverside Drive, New York 27, N. Y., U.S.A.

THEOLOGICAL COMMISSION ON TRADITION AND TRADITIONS

American Section

- Prof. A. C. OUTLER (Methodist Church), Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas 5, Texas, U.S.A. *Chairman.*
- Prof. GEORGES FLOROVSKY (Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, Ecumenical Patriarchate), Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge 38, Mass., U.S.A. *Vice-Chairman.*
- PIof. D. W. HAY (Presbyterian Church in Canada), Knox College, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. *Secretary.*
- Professor PIERCE BEAVER (United Church of Christ, U.S.A.), 401 A Swift Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill., U.S.A.
- Prof. SYDNEY E. AHLSTROM (Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church), 409 Prospect Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A.
- Prof. W. A. CLEBSCH (Protestant Episcopal Church), Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.
- Prof. E. R. FAIRWEATHER (Anglican Church in Canada), Trinity College, Hoskin Avenue, Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada.
- Dr. DONALD M. MATHER (United Church of Canada), Queen's Theological College, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.
- Prof. J. J. PELIKAN (Slovak Evangelical Lutheran Church), University of Chicago Divinity School, Chicago 37 Ill., U.S.A.
- Dr. GLENN ROUTH (Disciples of Christ), Brite College of the Bible, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas, U.S.A.
- Professor H. H. WALSH (Anglican Church in Canada), c/o Divinity Hall, 3520 University Street, Montreal 2, P.Q., Canada.

European Section

- Prof. K. E. SKYDSGAARD (Evangelical Lutheran Church of Denmark), St. Kannikestraede 11, 2, Copenhagen K., Denmark. *Chairman.*
- Rev. Professor S. L. GREENSLADE (Church of England), Christ Church, Oxford, England. *Vice-Chairman.*
- Prof. KONSTANTIN BONIS (Church of Greece), Epirou 27/VI, Athens, Greece.
- Professor G. B. CAIRD (United Church of Canada), Mansfield College, Oxford, England.
- Prof. Dr. GERHARDT EBELING (Evangelical Church in Germany) Nägeli-strasse 5, Zürich, Switzerland.
- Dr. E. FLESSEMAN VAN LEER (Dutch Reformed Church), Amstelhoven 10, Amstelveen, Netherlands.
- Rev. D. T. JENKINS (Congregational Union of England and Wales), The King's Weigh House Church, Duke Street, Grosvenor Square, London, W.1, England.
- Prof. Dr. JEAN-LOUIS LEUBA (Swiss Protestant Church Federation), 30 chemin de la Caille, Neuchâtel, Switzerland.
- Prof. EINAR MOLLAND (Church of Norway), Jacob Aals gt. 45b, Oslo, Norway.
- Prof. J. SCHNEIDER (Baptist Church in Germany), Johanna-Stegenstrasse 14, Berlin-Steglitz, Germany.

STUDY COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONALISM

- Dean WALTER G. MUELDER (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), 745 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston 15, Mass., U.S.A. *Chairman.*
- Prof. NILS EHRENSTRÖM (Church of Sweden), 745 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston 15, Mass., U.S.A. *Secretary.*
- Prof. CHANDRAN DEVANESEN (Church of South India), Madras Christian College, Tambaram, Chingleput District, South India.
- Dr. HANS DOMBOIS (Evangelical Church in Germany), Schmeilweg 5, Heidelberg, Germany.
- Dean C. R. FEILDING (Anglican Church in Canada), Trinity College, Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada.
- Dr. JAMES GUSTAFSON (United Church of Christ, U.S.A.) 409 Prospect Street, New Haven 11, Conn., U.S.A.
- Dr. BERNDT GUSTAFSSON (Church of Sweden), Rörlägggaravägen 10, Lund, Sweden.
- Rev. Dr. WILLIAM PICKERING (Church of England) St. John's College, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg 9, Canada.
- Prof. F. E. RECTOR (Disciples of Christ), Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis 7, Ind., U.S.A.
- Professor H.-H. SCHREY (Evangelical Church in Germany), Johanna-Stegenstrasse 14/III, Berlin-Steglitz, Germany.
- Prof. FREDERICK A. SHIPPEY (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), 52 Fairview Avenue, Madison, N.J., U.S.A.

**THE CONSTITUTION OF
THE COMMISSION ON FAITH AND ORDER**

(As accepted at the Third World Conference on Faith and Order, Lund, 1952, and subsequently revised by the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches, Evanston, 1954, and by the Central Committee, Davos, 1955.)

Title

1. The Commission shall be called the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches.

Meanings

2. In this Constitution :

The Commission means the above-named Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches.

The Working Committee means the Working Committee of the Commission on Faith and Order.

The Council means the above-named World Council of Churches.

The Assembly means the Assembly of the World Council.

The Central Committee means the Central Committee of the World Council.

Functions

3. The functions of the Commission are :

(i) To proclaim the essential oneness of the Church of Christ and to keep prominently before the World Council and the Churches the obligation to manifest that unity and its urgency for the work of evangelism.

(ii) To study questions of faith, order and worship with the relevant social, cultural, political, racial and other factors in their bearing on the unity of the Church.

(iii) To study the theological implications of the existence of the ecumenical movement.

(iv) To study matters in the present relationships of the Churches to one another which cause difficulties and need theological clarification.

(v) To provide information concerning actual steps taken by the Churches towards reunion.

4. All activities of the Commission shall be in accordance with the four principles of the Faith and Order Movement, viz. :

(i) Its main work is to draw Churches out of isolation into conferences, in which none is to be asked to be disloyal to or to compromise its convictions, but to seek to explain them to others while seeking to understand their points of view. Irreconcilable differences are to be recorded as honestly as agreements.

(ii) Its conferences are to be conferences of delegates officially appointed by the Churches to represent them. (iii) The invitation to take part in these conferences is addressed to Christian Churches throughout the world which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. (iv) Only Churches themselves are competent to take actual steps towards reunion by entering into negotiations with one

another. The work of the Movement is not to formulate schemes and tell the Churches what they ought to do, but to act as the handmaid of the Churches in the preparatory work of clearing away misunderstandings, discussing obstacles to reunion, and issuing reports which are submitted to the Churches for their consideration.

Organization

5. (i) World Conferences on Faith and Order are to be held when main subjects are ready for submission to the Churches, and when, on recommendation of the Commission on Faith and Order, the Central Committee so decides.

(ii) The Commission on Faith and Order shall consist of 85 members appointed by the Assembly of the World Council, with power to nominate additional members up to the number of 15 for appointment by the Central Committee, all these to hold office until the next Assembly (subject, however, to any revision advised by a World Conference on Faith and Order as hereinafter provided). At each Assembly the list of membership shall be revised in the light of recommendations made by the Commission. When a World Conference is held, it shall advise the Central Committee on any necessary revision of the membership of the Commission between that Conference and the next Assembly. In making appointments care shall be taken to secure the adequate geographical and confessional representation of Churches.

The Commission may include members of Churches which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour but are not members of the World Council.

Vacancies shall be filled by the Central Committee on the recommendation of the Commission.

Before appointments are made, steps shall be taken to ensure that the appointments proposed are acceptable to the Churches concerned.

(iii) The Commission shall normally meet every three years but may be called together at any time when major theological commission reports need to be reviewed by a larger body than the Working Committee.

(iv) The Commission shall nominate from its own members, for appointment by the Central Committee, a Working Committee of not more than 22 members with power to nominate not more than 3 additional members. The Chairman of the Commission shall also be a member *ex officio* of the Working Committee. The Working Committee shall normally meet annually and shall be responsible (a) for administration (b) for directing the study work and other activities of Faith and Order and (c) for co-operation with other agencies of the World Council.

Vacancies in the Working Committee shall be filled by the Working Committee itself from the membership of the Commission and submitted to the Central Committee for appointment.

(v) There shall be various theological commissions set up by the Commission or Working Committee. Theological commissions may include as members or consultants persons who are not members of the Commission.

Meetings of the Commission

6. The Chairman of the Commission, or in his absence the Vice-Chairman, shall preside at meetings of the Commission. In the absence of these officers, the meeting shall elect its own Chairman. One-sixth of the total membership shall constitute a quorum.

7. The notices of meetings shall be issued by the Secretary.
8. Members of the Commission can name substitutes to represent them at meetings at which they are unable to be present themselves.
9. On questions of Faith and Order the Commission shall not adopt any resolutions, but shall confine itself to recording for the information of the Churches such agreements and disagreements as are discovered.
10. Questions of procedure and the conduct of the business of the Commission shall be decided by a majority vote of those present and voting.
11. The Working Committee may, either at a meeting of the Commission or previously, determine the rules of procedure and of debate for the meeting.
12. Persons not being members of the Commission may be invited by the Chairman or the Secretary to be present and speak, but they cannot vote.

Chairman

13. The Chairman shall be elected by a majority of votes at a duly convened meeting of the Commission, on the nomination of the Working Committee.
14. The Chairman shall hold office for three years from the date of his appointment, but shall be eligible for re-election.
15. In the event of the office of Chairman falling vacant by reason of resignation, incapacity or death, the Vice-Chairman shall act as Chairman of the Commission until such time as a meeting of the Commission can be called.

Vice-Chairman

16. A Vice-Chairman shall be elected by the Commission on the nomination of the Working Committee, shall hold office for three years, and shall be eligible for re-election.

The Secretariat

17. There shall be at least one Secretary who shall be a member of the staff of the Council employed for the work of the Commission on a full time basis.
18. The Secretary or Secretaries shall be nominated by the Commission to the Central Committee.
19. It shall be the special responsibility of the Secretary to maintain full consultation and co-operation with the General Secretariat and with the other Departments of the Council, and particularly with the Division of Studies.
20. The salaries or honoraria to be paid to the Secretary or Secretaries shall be determined by the Working Committee and the officers of the Council in consultation.

The Working Committee

21. The Commission shall appoint the Chairman of the Working Committee.
22. Members of the Working Committee shall hold office until the next meeting of the Commission, when the list of membership shall be revised.

23. The Working Committee shall have power to act on behalf of the Commission in all matters where action is required before a meeting of the Commission can be convened.

24. The Working Committee shall meet at such times and places as the Chairman and the Secretary shall decide to be required for the performance of its duty.

25. The quorum for a meeting of the Working Committee shall be seven members present.

26. If at any time when it is inconvenient to convene a meeting the Chairman and Secretary shall decide that there is business needing an immediate decision by the Working Committee, it shall be permissible for them to obtain by post the opinions of its members and the majority opinion thus ascertained shall be treated as equivalent to the decision of a duly convened meeting.

The Department

27. The Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretaries, Chairman of the Working Committee and the Chairmen of Theological Commissions shall together be known as the Council's Faith and Order Department.

28. The Department shall be responsible for continuously carrying on the work of the Commission between meetings of the Commission and the Working Committee, both by (i) promoting the studies of the Theological Commissions and (ii) following all developments in the matter of the union of Churches and keeping all the Churches informed of these developments. It shall maintain full consultation and co-operation with the Division of Studies of the Council.

29. The Secretaries shall be the only officers of the Commission employed by the Council on a full-time basis; the other members of the Department shall be persons giving part-time service to the Commission whilst being also actively engaged in the service of their own Churches.

The Theological Commissions

30. The work of the Theological Commissions shall be to prepare reports which may serve as the basis for discussion in the Commission, at the Assemblies of the World Council, or at Conferences on Faith and Order, on the subjects referred to them under § 5 (v) above.

31. Each Theological Commission shall be composed of a Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary with other members chosen for their special competence in the particular field of study and representing as wide a variety as possible of ecclesiastical traditions. The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary shall be appointed by the Commission, and they shall then select and appoint the other members in consultation with the Working Committee, or in case of emergency with the Secretary of the Commission.

The Budget

32. The Commission's financial year shall run from 1st January to 31st December.

33. An annual budget of expenditure shall be drawn up by the Secretary in consultation with the Finance Committee of the Council ; it shall be submitted to the Working Committee for its approval and when so approved shall be submitted to the Council for final adoption. Copies shall then be sent to all members of the Commission.

34. The budget shall specify the amount allocated for the expenses of each Theological Commission, and each Theological Commission shall be responsible for deciding its manner of using its allocation within the limits prescribed in the budget.

Revision

35. Any amendment to this Constitution shall be submitted by the Faith and Order Commission and must be approved by the Assembly or the Central Committee.

RECENT FAITH AND ORDER PUBLICATIONS

- FOC No. 23 Minutes of Working Committee meeting, Herrenalb, Germany, 17-20 July 1956. Sw. Fr. 2.—; 2s. 6d.; \$.50
- FOC No. 24 Responses of the Churches to the Report of the Third World Conference on Faith and Order, Lund 1952. Geneva 1957. Sw. Fr. 2.—; 2s. 6d.; \$.50
- FOC No. 25 Minutes of the Faith and Order Commission meeting, New Haven, 20-25 July 1957. Sw. Fr. 2.—; 2s. 6d.; \$.50
- FOC No. 26 Minutes of the Working Committee meeting, Geneva, 15-20 July 1958. Geneva, Sw. Fr. 2.50; 3s.; \$.75
- FOC No. 27 Minutes of the Working Committee meeting, Spittal, Austria, August 1959. Sw. Fr. 2.—; 2s. 6d.; \$.50
- FOC No. 11c Survey of Church Union Negotiations (offprint from *The Ecumenical Review*, April 1957). Sw. Fr. —.50; 9d.; \$.15

Leaflet for the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity, in English, German and French: Available in quantity from WCC, Geneva, British Council of Churches, London, and WCC, New York.

Church Union Schemes, Agreements on Intercommunion etc. — a number of the most recent documents are available from the Faith and Order office in Geneva. A list of these may be obtained from the Secretary.

